The LUTHERAN CHURCH QUARTERLY

OCTOBER, 1929

THE CHIEF PROBLEMS OF LUTHERAN MISSIONARY WORK THAT ARISE FROM THE PRESENT SITUATION[1]

FREDERICK H. KNUBEL
NEW YORK, N. Y.

At a meeting of leading Hindus, Mohammedans, and Christians in India, where the Christian message had been presented, I heard a wise Mohammedan judge shrewdly uphold Mohammedanism, saying that a man must first be a good Christian if he is to be a good Mohammedan. Then, however, he paid a glowing tribute to Christian missionaries, saying that if one has a treasure in his heart he must long to impart it to others and that in such unselfish service Mohammedans and Hindus have much to learn from Christians. In this I find a summary of the chief problems and responsibilities of Lutheran missionary work, that we must discover anew what a treasure we have in our hearts. In the home lands as well as in the missionary lands the Lutheran church itself must be evangelized and given a fresh grasp of our gospel. We must of course do a far larger missionary work ourselves, for the church which is non-missionary will perish just as centuries ago the Christian churches of North Africa perished. But we must also exert a stronger and more helpful influence upon world-wide missionary plans, for we possess treasures of principle which are eternal. In order to exert such influence

1 This, and the three articles which follow were read at the Lutheran World Convention in Copenhagen, June 26-July 4, 1929.

we must maintain our principles and use them and impart them.

In order to discern our responsibility we may well examine the present situation, to which our subject refers. Probably no better picture thereof could be painted than was exhibited by the enlarged meeting of the International Missionary Council held at Jerusalem in the spring of 1928. As time passes it is ever more clearly to be recognized that even if that council did not solve all the problems presented, it revealed them accurately and gave a definite understanding of the present situation. Longer thought upon those problems also convinces one that the solutions cannot be reached merely by changes in missionary methods, but only by fresh study of the fundamentals of Christianity. Both the present situation and the character of missionary problems require that we consider essential principles. Naturally such study ought to develop results which are important not only to missionary work, but also to the healthy existence of the church everywhere and to all of its operations.

Three terms were echoed and re-echoed through the discussions upon the Mount of Olives, until it seems that everything of importance at the meeting can be grouped around them. They were syncretism, secularism, and social gospel or social Christianity. The representatives at the meeting of the council were in the first place face to face with the question as to whether the Christian church shall now proceed to study anew and with appreciation the religions of non-Christian lands, to compare them with the truths of the Christian faith, and so to establish the priority of Christianity; or whether the values discovered in those religions might find a place in an ultimate composite Christianity, as a fuller appreciation of Christ; or whether primarily there must be a reassertion of the uniqueness and universality of Christianity as a revelation, as a gift of God. Nothing was more gratifying at Jerusalem than the ringing emphasis upon the uniqueness of Christianity, as an answer to any tendencies towards syncretism.

Stress was laid upon secularism as constituting the

chief enemy today against missionary effort. It has invaded and pervaded the missionary countries through materialistic philosophies, through economic theories such as Bolshevism, through nationalistic tendencies, and through other sources. It has weakened even the religions of these nations, has led to demands for educational institutions from which religion is divorced (inincluding missionary institutions), would naturally reduce merciful service to a merely humanitarian basis, if not worse, and would in the end permit even a national Christian church to exist only as the tool of an utterly secularized government.

The Jerusalem Conference could not be unmindful in the third place of the shocking conditions in missionary lands, which are of a moral, social, and economic character. It is amid these problems that the social gospel or social Christianity is advocated, just as in the home countries; for the conditions as manifested to the missionary are far worse than at home. Direct action for the relief of the situation must, it would seem, be mass action. The individual cannot be helped excepting through change of the general conditions. National governments themselves must be brought to a correction of the conditions. Thus the missionary endeavor, the Christian church, is led to the verge of a dictation to the state.

It may be an exaggeration, but it is suggestive to indicate that syncretism says all religions are true; secularism says all religions are false and also says the state must be lord over the church; the social gospel says the church must be lord over the state.

These three topics were outstanding ones at Jerusalem, even though the program did not specifically mention them. They constitute important elements of the present situation. We must discuss them if we are to recognize our missionary problems and also our Lutheran responsibility. We shall consider them in the reverse order from that stated above.

THE SOCIAL GOSPEL

It is well that we Lutherans recognize our lack of activity in social endeavor, as such endeavor is fostered in some countries today. Our tendency is always to a passive attitude, because of our unwillingness for and fear of a Christianity which has been humanly determined and is humanly inspired, and which is merely a busy interference with God's plans. Perhaps we are so deep-going in our considerations that we neglect attention to external development and external activity. The horrors that are exhibited in foreign lands ought alone stir us to self-examination lest we fail in our stewardship. Whatever we may lack, we cannot, however, transfer our allegiance to any idea that the Kingdom of God comes through the adoption of Christian conceptions by organized society, apart from a change of heart on the part of the individuals who form that society. We must inseparably couple the first three petitions of the Lord's Prayer. God's Kingdom comes not merely in the doing of his will by men but also in the hallowing of his name —that is, in the heart's acceptance of his revelation of himself. His will is not truly done unless it is also loved. It is furthermore evident that the advocates of the social gospel have developed a manifest inconsistency in their views. No term is more extensively used by them at present than "the sacredness of personality." Reference to it was a daily fact at the Jerusalem Conference, and it was made a foundation pillar for the construction of various ideas. Emphasis upon that term is clearly a return to the individualistic point of view on the part of the very ones who urge the social gospel.

What is needed by all Christians is an appreciation that the gospel is primarily an individual gospel because it concerns primarily an individual, Jesus Christ. The sacredness of personality which ought to be emphasized is the sacred personality of Christ. Our attention must not be so completely focused upon men, whether as individuals or as social groups, that we forget we are simply Christ's ministers. We must look at social problems

through his eyes. He must be our center and our guide. We need new concentration upon a Christ-centered gospel. The message is his message, and he himself is the message. Such a gospel and such an approach to social evils will also receive a particularly welcome hearing in missionary lands. Never before has the name of Christ been so highly honored there as now. It is true that sectional and syncretistic motives influence this honor. Christ is exalted as having been an oriental, and his teachings are contemplated with adjustments to the religions of the East. There is, nevertheless, genuine appreciation of him, and that which is manifestly his message will have a hearing. What does he teach?

Christ's view of social conditions is that they are utterly wrong and that they are incurable apart from him. No advocate of the social gospel, no reformer, no traveler of the world ever regards the evils among men with such horror as did he. When Kant spoke of "das radikale Böse" he had learned of Christ. When Paul heard creation groaning and travailing together in pain he had the ears of his Lord. Decay is everywhere. Misery, pain, weakness, injustice are universal. Man is essentially a sufferer. Conditions are in themselves incurably bad. The world's great curse has always been its sense of well-being or its belief that conditions will improve. "This is the soft, warm mountain-fog that blots out the far horizons and clouds the summits and smothers our vision down to the near view of life." We must see Christ's tears and hear him groaning in spirit and mark his compassion and go with him even to Gethsemane before we understand. We must see him suffer wrongfully and see his heart suffering for mankind, before we know the world's evil. We may classify and define it as natural evil and moral evil and by other names, but we do not thereby change it.

Christ also reveals sin to men. Because of him, the holy One, we know it. Because of his cross, as the focus of the great cosmic struggle between righteousness and sin, between God's will and man's wilfulness, we know it. He shows its essential, its antisocial root as selfishness.

It is deep and real and guilty and universal. All men know better than they desire, desire better than they will, will better than they do. The world is a nightmare of sin.

Further the evil and the sin of the world are distinct, according to Christ. They are, it is true, bound in an intimate and intricate relationship. The evil of society is a result of the sin of society. Every man is a corporate member of the human group, and he cannot sin alone nor can he sin without pouring the consequence of his iniquity into other lives. Those whom I do not know and who do not know me suffer because of my omissions and transgressions. There is also that other relationship of sin and evil which is evident in Christ's own suffering, namely, the vicarious blessing whereby evil as suffered by him is healing power for the sin of the world. In the nexus of humanity these associations of the two are mighty. Christ's teaching, however, holds sin and evil to be distinct as over against any views of Gnostics and of some modern science, which tend to reduce sin to evil or to make evil the cause of sin, so that man's wrong-doing and wrong-thinking becomes only an expression of the manifold disorder of the world. Likewiwse our Lord cannot uphold the teaching of some non-Christian religions whereby the distresses of an individual's life are regarded as always a direct result of that individual's sins in the present or some previous existence. Here Christ upholds Job's protests, answers directly that a man's blindness came neither because of his own nor of his parent's sin, and supremely manifests in his own suffering but sinless existence that sin and evil are essentially distinct since they may be unrelated in the individual's life.

To this human mass whose evil and sin Christ has made so vivid he comes with a strange and wonderful message otherwise not heard. One word describes it, grace. One motive impels it, love. These are the central revelations of God's own being. There are, however, many forms of its manifstation to sinning, suffering society. In them we discern also the church's social responsibility.

The supreme and always primary manifestation of the message is the forgiveness of sin. Christ and his church must endlessly and primarily proclaim that forgiveness. It calls upon men to change their minds utterly, to repent, as to sin. They must no longer aim to hide it with its social consequences, nor deny its reality, nor love it, nor seek to pay for it in any form, nor believe they can suffer for it and cancel it. Men sinning with one another and aginst one another are mutually and individually to receive and impart forgiveness. This is the first corrective for human society, the first social message.

The second, as revealed in Christ and practiced by his church, is the serving love manifested in millions of deeds of unselfish mercy. In a world of misery and injustice Christ has set free great streams of service, individual and collective ones, which flow under his impulse and bless great areas.

The third, practiced by Christ and to be followed by his church, is a ministry of condemnation. In a world of wrong silence would in itself often be sin. Christ and his chuch do not however condemn as the world condemns. Judgment is not the purpose. The great difference is that they so condemn as to lead to repentance. Such condemnation is born of and guided by love. It is difficult to practice and invites study by those who would know the true social gospel. The specific aim will fundamentally modify the character of the condemnation.

The fourth is the patient ministry of education. When the hearts of Christians, of the church, are bleeding in sympathy with the oppressed and downtrodden, and when righteous indignation flames against unrighteousness and those who are responsible for it, the most effective course of action seems naturally to be coercion in one form or another. This cannot be the procedure of the Christian church, because it merely represses and does not cure social wrong and because it contradicts Christ's essential attitude of grace, of love. It is at this point that the advocates of the social gospel seem to hold a different attitude. The church must, however, with thousands of Christian schools, patiently teach the masses of men in

so-called Christian lands and in missionary lands, saturating the coming generations with the mind of Christ. Thus will the social human web be colored with the red of love and forgiveness and unselfishness and sacrifice.

In all of these manifestations or ministeries or methods the supreme aim is ultimately an evangelistic one, to lead men to an utter change of mind and to win them unto faith in Christ. It is only by faith in him that his blessing can be fully opened to men and his power be released for the healing of mankind.

An attempt has been made above to sketch the Christ-centered gospel, particularly in its relation to social needs and also in its relation to the missionary situation. To those who know the non-Christian systems of thought the differences in Christ's attitude are outstanding ones.

The Lutheran character of the Christ-centered gospel is clear. The supremacy of grace, the priority of the message of forgiveness, the sola fide, the conception of serving love, and the emphasis upon Christian education are in their full conception characteristic of Lutheranism. We must maintain them and urge their manifest application to the missionary problems of the world.

SECULARISM

In order to reveal the impression at Jerusalem concerning secularism, let me quote at length from Basil Mathews' review of the Conference.

> When it comes to real grips with the problem of the non-Christian systems, it is not just Islam, Hinduism, Confucianism, or Buddhism that holds the attention, but it is the materialist "secular civilization" that has itself sprung up in the midst of Western Christendom that is seen to be the enemy. Materialistic civilization is being spread over the whole planet by the West. And this materialism is discovered to be the enemy not only of the Christian religion but of religion as a whole, corrosive for the most part of the whole religious attitude of life. Not science, not invention, not commerce in themselves, but the materialism that controls them is the enemy.
>
> "Christianity," wrote a Chinese teacher in a startling letter read by Dr. Robert Speer, "is making inroads upon the other religions from one side; but they are suffering a great deal more in the rear from a group of new enemies—scientific agnosticism,

materialistic determination, political fascism, moral iconoclasm. These have advanced so far into their territory that Christianity must, for all practical purposes, ignore the incapacitated older religions. It must think of its frontier work in terms of what it will have to do with these new forces."

It is, as Dr. Speer showed, not only against the background of non-Christian religions, but also against this new secular and naturalistic view which has spread across the world that we have to state our message. The ultimate issue lies in this realm of secular life, in the irreligious and anti-religious systems and attitudes, even more than with the religions other than Christian. This is a battle, not simply for the missionary, but for the whole church, including in particular men of science and philosophers. Christianity itself in its own citadels has to face these same vigorous, insistent, undermining enemies. Clearly a new alignment of our whole battlefront is demanded.

This monstrous hydra-headed menace of materialism loomed, for the Council, above all other enemies.

As has previously been indicated, this secularism assumes a powerful influence in all of the missionary problems. It influences all plans for the establishment of native Christian churches, including the relation of the native government to them and also their nationalistic enthusiasm. It works mightily in educational developments, aiming to divorce religion from education. The social and industrial questions become more complicated than ever. Racial questions are injected into the religious situation more sharply than ever before. The validity of all religions is questioned.

As over against secularism what has Christianity to offer? It has a single wonderful treasure, ignored too often by Christians themselves when facing secularism, but alone effective against it. Christianity should not aim to offer a philosophy nor an argument. It should persistently present a manifest reality existing in the world which is spiritual and eternal and divine, namely, the church. These attributes of the church furnish the answer to secularism. Just as in our previous consideration it was Christ and the Christ-centered gospel which are to be exalted, so here it is the church of Christ which we must magnify. Only by an understanding of and an exaltation of the church as a spiritual and an

eternal and a divine reality in the world can seculrism be overcome. The church is frequently derided by those who are without. Sad to say, she is also frequently minimized by her own members, who do not truly recognize her nature and power, do not love her intensely, and do not glorify her in their hearts and in their songs. The church is eternal because her origin is to be traced, not to the day of Pentecost, but to an eternal idea and purpose in the mind of God. She is divine because she is the Body of Christ, one with him in the fulness of his being. She is spiritual, because her people are invisibly bound together in the mighty possession of a common new life from Christ. She is a manifest reality in the world through the unworldly gospel of grace and love and forgiveness and faith proclaimed by her in and to the world and through the Christ-given sacraments of initiation and communion administered by her.

It must be left to the reader to reflect upon the forceful meaning of this definitely spiritual but visibly existing entity in a secularized world, for we must hasten on to note a fearful danger into which the church may fall. It has always been a danger; she has frequently fallen into it, but it stands as a menace to her above all in this age of secularization. It is the danger that the church herself become secularized. She thereby sells her birthright as a spiritual reality in the world and nullifies her testimony against secularization. Let us cite a few of the many forms of this possibility.

Under the previous heading it was mentioned that the followers of the social gospel are sometimes led to use coercive methods. They would aim, for instance, to cure the secular drudgery and slavery of the common people by secular methods, at least in part. The curse of secularism is thereby increased, for to just the extent of such use of coercive secular methods the church itself becomes secularized.

Another example is provided by recent occurrences at Rome. We have all been interested in the pope's agreement with Italy. The pope's explanation thereof sounds laudable, that he would have the church as a spiritual

force become independent of any nation. The fact is, however, that the church thus becomes an entity, bound to no nation, but free to form concordats with each and every nation, standing on a level with them as one of two parties to a contract. The church is lowered. The church is secularized. Her very freedom, her unrelated position, her consequent need for the establishment of agreements, reduces her to the plane of those with whom she makes engagements.

Whenever a denominational group aims to become world-wide in its operations and to consolidate itself as one organization throughout the world, so that from one nation governing influence upon the church in another nation is exercised, there the danger of secularization appears again. In these days of world conventions of denominations the danger must be warded off. The autonomy of the denominational group in each nation must be preserved intact from interference on the part of the church in another land. In missionary operations the movement toward the autonomy of the native church should be encouraged to proceed as rapidly as is properly possible.

The tendency in missionary lands toward the establishment of national churches of any type is full of the danger of secularization today. The church must not be a mere tool of nationalistic aspirations. Its central power as a spiritual force is thereby broken. At Jerusalem the Chinese Christian, Dr. Cheng Ching-yi, well expressed the degree to which a Chinese church should be Chinese in character. He said, "By an indigenous church we mean a Christian church that is best adapted to meet the religious needs of the Chinese people, most congenial to Chinese life and culture, and most effective in arousing in Chinese Christians the sense of responsibility." In no additional respects should a church have a particular national character.

As Lutherans we cannot refrain from expressing our belief that any instistence upon the necessity of a particular form of the Christian ministry constitutes a secularization of the church. Similarly we believe that the

insistence upon any one form of church polity as a necessity for the church has fallen into the same danger.

Turning away from these examples and returning to our thought of the church as a spiritual reality in the world, we ought to recognize once more the increasing need for a better understanding of the church by the church itself. Long ago Delitzsch said that like a will-o'-the-wisp the idea of the church always evades us. Our present problems increasingly demand a more definite conception of the truth concerning the church, and the Holy Spirit will reveal it to us.

The conception of the church and of its place here presented has been of a definitely Lutheran character. We should therefore recognize once more from the present situation and from the missionary problems the need that we maintain and impart our Lutheran principles. Our thought and work we saw previously to be Christocentric. We see now that they must also be churchcentric. It is our faith as incorporated in a Lutheran church which must stand, not for the sake of the name but for the sake of Christ and his church.

SYNCRETISM

It was said above that the Jerusalem meeting of the International Missionary Council issued a most gratifying message as to the uniqueness of Christianity, and thus gave a satisfying answer to any tendencies toward gross syncretism. Nevertheless voices were heard there which manifested that syncretistic developments may be increasingly expected in coming years. The mildest and worthiest of these calls was for a sympathetic appreciation of real values in the non-Christian systems. We know furthermore that a conference of all religions is planned (not by the Council) for 1930 in order to consider the topic of world peace. At the recent convention of the American Federal Council of Churches a resolution was submitted calling for the establishment of "a republic of religions," designed "to bring together leaders of Christian and non-Christian sects for discussion of

mutual welfare aspirations." (It should be added that no action was taken upon this resolution).

There are powerful influences at work in the world which inevitably press towards an actual syncretism in some definite form. One of these is found in the spread of that secularism to which our second part was devoted. It saturates the life of the world and has been effecting, as was stated, a breakdown of the religions of the world. Christianity feels it also. Thus it becomes seemingly a common enemy of religion in the world, and the natural inclination is towards a combination of religions against it. This was advocated at Jerusalem as follows:

> The new situation is brought about by the fact that there is a world philosophy which is spreading itself by no teaching or missionary effort, but by its own power as an accompaniment of industrial civilization. We may call it scientific materialism or naturalism. It appears as something opposed to all religions. The universal spread of this type of philosophy requires a new alignment of religious forces, a recognition of alliance with whatever is of the true substance of religion everywhere. We have to recognize, not only that this type of philosophy is becoming universal, but also that a world religion exists. We give religious systems separate names; but they are not separate, they are not closed globules. They merge in the universal human faith in the Divine Being. Unless this is recognized the problem is mis-stated.

In that quotation we recognize also a second influence towards syncretism, in the constant reappearance of the idea that some ultimate and absolute religion should be sought into which all existing religions can be merged.

A third influence exists in the common tendency of the world today to effect huge combinations. The political, economic, business, social spheres of life seem to be busy chiefly with the formation of great organizations. It is natural that the same impulse should seize religion.

A more subtle influence arises from an overemphasis upon the differences among men of different nationalities and religions. We are asked to appreciate the age-long backgrounds behind them, out from which their religions have developed, and which must be respected if the peoples are to be influenced. The implication naturally is, though not fully stated, that Christianity, at least in its

present form, developed from our background and that it may well go through a process of syncretizing modification in order that it may have become a better religion. Let us fully recognize that there are differences among men, some of them even deeper than their backgrounds. But Christ approaches men on a plane where all are alike, that is, in their sin and suffering. He draws them also to a common level before his cross. "There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female: for ye are all one in Christ Jesus."

It seems inevitable that the widespread tendencies just described will exert increasing pressure and produce syncretistic movements. Before we proceed, however, to state that which we believe needs emphasis by the Christian church as over against syncretism, let us fully acknowledge that Christ has been finding his way among non-Christian peoples and that traces of his teachings may be increasingly discovered. Let us fully believe also that God has not "left himself without witness" among them through the ages and that truly divine impulses are there. We may also be confident that a fuller appreciation of our Christ can develop for us all through the inclusion of these new Christians from missionary lands in the church. In general we must recognize whatever is the truth in those lands. We may even do more and incorporate much else from them, so long as it is not contrary to the truth. It is only a compromise of the truth which must be refused.

Let us now recognize the reason for this refusal and thus also lay our emphasis against syncretism. Christianity as a gift from God is not merely a revelation. It is not only a bestowal of cold truth for our mental digestion. It is not just a system of thought, a philosophy, a Weltanschauung, which can be weighed against other systems, and be tempered or altered by them. The revelation, the truth, the Word of God is divine, creative energy, is dynamite (dunamis). The Word of God is the power of God. "The sword of the Spirit is the Word of God." "The weapons of our warfare are not carnal,

but mighty through God to the pulling down of strongholds—casting down imaginations, and every high thing that exalteth itself against the knowledge of God, and bringing into captivity every thought to the obedience of Christ."

The fact is simple but of commanding importance that the revelation, the truth, the Word of God is the means of grace—the channel, the vehicle of that grace, that love, that forgiveness, that faith which is the whole of Christianity. It is the vehicle of creative energy. How can it be permitted to enter into syncretistic compromise with that which is not filled with the Spirit of truth, of power? It is only by this recognition of the Word of God as a living, lifegiving, divine force that we can save ourselves from dangerous entanglements with that which does not possess divine energy.

We who know the faith of the Lutheran church will naturally have in mind the consistent force with which this idea of the means of grace is emphasized among us.

In conclusion, it is not difficult to summarize in brief form our entire view of the present situation and of the consequent missionary problems, as we have considered them. On the one hand stand social gospel, secularism, and syncretism. On the other Christ, the church, and the means of grace. In them is our lasting confidence.

A closing word to this Lutheran World Convention. Previous addresses delivered here will unquestionably have stressed the need of Lutheran solidarity in every land and throughout the world. This paper aims merely to add testimony from the missionary fields to the same end. We must have in the first place Lutheran solidarity in every missionary land also. In the second place we ought to study anew what is emphatically universal in our faith as a Lutheran church. We should also seek to recognize what is unique to us as Lutheran Christians in this universal testimony of ours. Thus we would know what we must advocate among other Christians for the general advancement of a pure Christianity throughout the world. Perhaps we ought to aim at a world statement of Lutheranism—not a new creed, but the great

inclusiveness of all that we now see our Christ-centered gospel to be. Recognizing in the third place the growing importance of the International Missionary Council and believing that we can make important contributions to the solution of missionary problems we should seek larger representation in the Council than exists at present from Lutheran centers of missionary operation. Finally, our people in all lands must be persuaded into a more intelligent devotion to our faith and its spread through missionary activity.

THE CHURCH'S FAITH AND CONFESSION IN THE LIGHT OF MARBURG AND AUGSBURG[1]

WERNER ELERT
ERLANGEN, GERMANY

There is an intimate relation between faith and confession. The church that has a faith has also a confession. And the church always confesses what it believes. "I believe," answered the Ethiopian eunuch to Philip's question, "I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God." On the basis of that confession he was baptized. And with that confession he became a member of the Christian church. "I believe," begins the Apostles' Creed. "I believe," begins the Nicene Creed. "He who would be saved must first of all have the true Christian faith," begins the Athanasian Creed. And the Marburg Articles, signed by Luther and Zwingli and the other disputants October 3, 1529, begin with a statement of those things which we "on both sides mutually believe." Finally, also the Augsburg Confession, at least in the Latin edition, begins with a "credendum esse," a statement of what must be believed, like the Nicene Creed. Thus it is clear that whenever the church sets forth a confession it confesses the fact that it has faith and it confesses what the content of that faith is.

This truth may seem self-evident, but as soon as it is stated we are confronted with serious difficulties. Can we say "credendum esse," something must be believed? Is it really faith, the genuine faith that saves a man, which the Athanasian Creed sets forth, one might almost say, compresses, in its systematic formula of twenty-eight articles? In a case like that, is not faith really made into a law that must be observed? But how can faith be made into a law if it derived from the Gospel? Does not the Augsburg Confession in this respect sacri-

1 Translated from the German by Abdel Ross Wentz, Gettsburg, Pa.

fice one of the most valuable achievements of the Reformation, namely, the right, as Luther called it, "libenter credere," the right to believe freely and willingly?

We cannot help recalling in this connection the "fides implicita" of the mediaeval theologians, the faith that is "wrapped up." For those theologians faith was the acceptance of certain doctrinal propositions concerning God or the Trinity. Men accepted these propositions either because they had reasoned them out or because by sheer will-power they had determined to accept them in spite of the fact that they could not with good conscience hold them to be true. This latter method of acceptance was the one taught by the last of the mediaeval schools of theology. Now it was one of the primary facts of the Reformation movement that it broke completely with this idea of faith. To believe, said the Reformers, is to receive the forgiveness of sins. Nothing else. It was his clear perception of this fact that made Luther restore the Pauline Gospel. But if faith is nothing more nor less than the forgiveness of sins, what has it to do with the sort of faith that clothes itself in long doctrinal statements?

This brings us face to face with one of the fundamental problems of present-day theology. And not only so. It is the decisive question for the Christian church. The theologians of the nineteenth century thought that the chief problem in theology was a problem of philosophy. They thought that if they could solve the philosophic question they could thereby bridge the great chasm that yawned between the church and the people, both the masses and the classes.

And to a certain extent they were right. For as a matter of fact under the influence of philosophy and history and the natural sciences there have arisen certain views of life and of the world that have made the people of our day deaf to the message of the church. The theologians of the last century thought that the reason for this alienation of the rank and file of the people from the church and its theology lay in the fact that the church had based its teachings upon the philosophy of antiquity

or the antiquated mediaeval point of view. They felt that the church of the nineteenth century was teaching things that no modern man could conscientiously assent to. The salvation of the church and the recovery of its influence, they felt, could only be effected by limiting its message very strictly to the subjective and emotional life of men and by allowing men complete freedom to fashion their intellectual philosophy in accord with the general style of modern thinking. This, they claimed, was precisely the idea of faith as it was understood by the sixteenth century Reformers. The "sola fide" of the Reformation, they argued, meant the proclamation of something purely subjective, something that must be kept absolutely free from any binding doctrinal statements. But we know how the purposes of these theologians have worked out in practice. The limitation of the church's message to the purely subjective has done practically nothing at all towards winning back to the church those who were estranged.

II

In solving this problem we must first of all ask the question: What is faith in the evangelical sense of the word? The answer is often given in Luther's words as they stand in the Large Catechism: "Two things belong together, faith and God." At any rate this answer implies that those who would understand faith to be something purely subjective cannot claim Luther for their position. But it is equally insufficient and even misleading to take the position that was taken by the theologians and philosophers during the period of rationalism, namely, that faith is the conviction that there is a God. In a document that was written in 1523, a document that for centuries was thought to have been written by Luther, we read: "The entire ground for faith consists of the single little sentence, 'There is a God'" (Weimar Edition, xi, 469, 23). But it has now been proved that the document is not genuine. It makes use of many quotations from Luther's works. But the sentence that we have quoted could never have been written by Luther.

For Luther says in another place that a faith that has such content might be a science but it could not be a faith (Weimar Edition, vii, 7, 215, 4).

Luther recognizes no neutral or purely intellectual conviction of the existence of God. For Luther such a conviction is always colored with a knowledge of God's anger or his mercy. I have either an angry God or a gracious God: there is no other alternative. But a God of anger cannot be an object of faith. This is true because, for one thing, a God of anger is known to us through our whole natural life, our reason and conscience and the world of nature. The wrath of God presents itself as a matter of course when we experience the limitations of mortal life and the certainty of death. One may indeed deny the wrath of God or forget it, just as one may for a time forget the certainty of death. But just as soon as one permits the voice of conscience to speak, even the natural man cannot escape the certainty of divine wrath.

Luther does occasionally, like the writer of Hebrews (11:1), refer to faith as belief in the invisible, the evidence of things not seen, belief contrary to appearances, an act of venture (Weimar Edition, vii, 215). But the invisible in this connection is not the existence of an invisible God or even the existence of an immaterial or supernatural world. The appearances against which the faith of the Christian operates are rather the wrath of God. It is the inevitable connection between sin and condemnation, which our conscience asserts but which our faith denies. The great venture of my faith lies in the fact that I come into the presence of a God of wrath who condemns my sins and yet I come with the conviction and the certainty that he forgives my sins. That is what is meant when we say that faith is the evidence of things not seen. When, therefore, Luther teaches, as Paul did, that faith is reckoned as righteousness or even that faith is righteousness in the sight of God, it can only mean that he who ventures to go into the presence of God with the assurance that God forgives him his sins actually receives the forgiveness of his sins. And just

this is the kernel of the chief article of every Lutheran confession, namely, the article on justification.

Now in the evangelical understanding of the matter this faith is inseparably connected with repentance. Righteousness which is valid in the sight of God must always be the righteousness of God which he bestows upon us. It is always "aliena justitia" if we contrast it with our own merit and condition. It is always accompanied by the "accusatio sui" of the sinner, as Luther expresses it. And this self-accusation of the sinner includes his entire being. When faith receives the righteousness of God this can never mean that man is rewarded because he has compelled himself to believe. That would only mean that we were basing the righteousness of God on something that we ourselves accomplish. In other words, what gives faith the power to justify is not something subjective in the believer but the content of faith itself. And for Luther, as for Paul, the content of faith is nothing but Christ. Christ is our reconciliation with God. He is our peace. His righteousness is the "aliena justitia" which alone is valid in the sight of God, the righteousness which God bestows upon us.

Moreover, we should remember, as Paul says, that faith comes from preaching. For one cannot believe in Christ unless Christ be proclaimed. This proclamation is effected by the church. Thus the pure subjectivity of faith is dissolved by two facts. True, faith is subjective, but its subjective character grows out of the content of faith itself, namely, Christ. And this subjective quality in faith has its source in Christ because his righteousness in us is always "aliena justitia," imputed righteousness. Secondly, as there is no faith without the proclamation of Christ, there can be no faith without a church. Faith therefore is not purely subjective, because Christ is its content and because the church is its medium.

III

This conception of faith appears in nearly every part of our confession. The articles on justification, repent-

ance, faith and good works, are specially intended to strengthen the conviction that our standing before the judgment of God is not due to any human deed or good will or ethical quality, but that our righteousness can only be "aliena justitia." And everything that is said concerning the freedom of the will, original sin, vows, saints, and the Mass is intended to serve the same purpose and assure the purity of the evangelical faith.

But why the necessity of written confessions? Why is there any formulation of this conception of faith in the long and short articles of the confessions and their doctrinal statements? If we survey the whole confessional process from 1524 on, we observe that there is a constantly increasing effort to state clearly and distinctly the doctrine of faith and justification. At first, for example, in the Ansbach Ratschlag of 1524, the doctrine of Justification comes near the close and in much shorter form than, for example, the doctrine of the Church and the Sacraments. In the Apology for the Augsburg Confession and in Luther's Schmalkald Articles a great change is already apparent and the doctrine of justification dominates the whole of those confessions.

This leading rôle is already assigned to that doctrine in the Augsburg Confession itself. At Augsburg the evangelical estates defended their breach with the Roman church and its practice. That defense furnishes the key to the interpretation of the Augsburg Confession. But in their criticism of the church the confessors of Augsburg did not set up as an ideal any new church which they claimed to have founded or proposed to found. Their criticisms never suggested that the Catholic church as such must cease, but only that those things in the church which contradicted their evangelical faith must be changed. This marks the progress that had been made in the confessional process between 1524 and 1530. It is useless to speak of reforming the church and its forms of worship until there is complete clarity concerning evangelical faith, i. e. concerning the all-important article on justification.

But once this article is recognized as the impregnable

citadel of the Reformation movement, the confessions from that point of view exhibit the full power of their polemics against the Roman church. Their criticism on every count is based on the argument that the practice in question is contrary to the evangelical idea of justification, i. e. it is contrary to evangelical faith in the most elementary sense. This is the way in which they justified their criticism of Rome's forms of worship, especially the Mass; of her moral code, of her cultivation of piety, of her ideal of holiness, of her practice of pennance, of her hierarchical organization. Thus because of their conception of faith it was inevitable that the defense of the evangelicals should turn into attack. Even in the long articles of the second part of the Augsburg Confession it is everywhere the evangelical idea of faith that reveals the abuses and corrupt practices of the church.

If therefore we ask how, in the light of Augsburg, faith and confession are related, the answer is: the confession sets forth what evangelical faith demands of the church. Because the Roman church of that time did not meet the demand set forth in the confession and did not want to meet it, the breach had to come.

IV

But why did the Roman church not want to meet the demand of evangelical faith? The authors of the Papal Confutation of the Augsburg Confession declare in their introduction that they want to examine that confession and find out how much of it is "recte ac catholice," and they claim that the Emperor and his party have approved their refutation of the evangelicals and declare it to be orthodox and in harmony with the Gospel and the rest of Holy Scripture. Thus one confession is set up against another confession and one claim against another claim. Each insists that it is in harmony with catholic doctrine.

And not only in their claims do they harmonize. The papal confutation declares that the first article of the Augsburg Confession is acceptable to the papal party, and that there is no objection to the third article. The fifth article also, with certain limitations, may be ap-

proved. How can there be so much harmony between the evangelical confession and the Roman position when they are so hopelessly at variance in their teaching on faith and justification? The first article treats of God, the third treats of the Son of God, the fifth of the office of the ministry. With reference to the fifth the Confutation does point out that the Confession here in reality deals with the work of the Holy Spirit. But that is just as the evangelicals intended. In fact both of the confessions issued at Augsburg confirm what Luther had expressed in the Schmalcald Articles when he said that "the high doctrines that concern the divine majesty are not in dispute, because both we and our opponents acknowledge the same confession concerning them."

This measure of harmony may be greeted with gratitude today. If we are ever to have a belated reunion of all Christian churches, the beginning of it must be sought for in a harmony of views as to the doctrine of God. But it would be a mistake to suppose that one could be right in his doctrine of the divine majesty and at the same time be wrong in his doctrines of faith and justification. This connection between the doctrine of God and the doctrines of faith and justification is an absolutely necessary connection and it is supremely important for our purpose here. The Augsburg Confession says in its article on vows (XXVII, 38) that the teaching of the monks that religious activity or a monastic type of religion earns satisfaction for sins is contrary to the glory of Christ and derogatory to his honor. And in all the other confessions of our church there are similar references to the fact that everything that is said concerning faith and justification is said to the glory of Christ. According to these confessions to believe is the same as to glorify God,—not God in the general sense of the term but that God who is revealed in Christ and who imputes righteousness to us.

But we must remember that the righteousness of Christ which is valid before God must always be "aliena justitia" so far as we are concerned. Accordingly, the whole content of faith in the evangelical sense must be

expressed in terms of Christ and his righteousness. Nothing else matters. Take, for example, the third article of the Augusburg Confession. This article cannot be separated from the first and the fifth article, as the authors of the Confutation properly indicated. In that article we are told that he who really confesses that "Christ is true God and true man, was born, suffered, was crucified, dead and buried, that he was the propitiation not only for original sin but for all other sins and turned away God's wrath"—he who honestly and with the heart confesses this has faith and is justified even if he never speaks of faith or justification.

One could imagine a confession that would consist only of a thetical statement and, like the Apostles' Creed, would make no mention of faith except to indicate its content. Indeed, this method of confessional statement would in a measure help to secure the purity of evangelical faith because it would exclude all reference to men and human merit. It would be of particular value because it would make impossible any synergistic interpretation of faith.

In spite of their apparent harmony as to the doctrine of God, insuperable differences manifested themselves between the two parties at Augsburg. That was because the Roman church did not recognize the exclusive quality of the "aliena justitia" and denied the sufficiency of the great articles on the divine majesty. They added human ordinances. Much is said in the Augsburg Confession concerning the triune God, Christ, and the Holy Spirit, who works through Word and Sacraments. The purpose of all this is not to add new articles to the Apostles' Creed, for example, but simply and solely to prevent the addition of anything merely human.

Thus the believer's act of confessing gains significance from a second point of view. We are compelled to keep the content of faith free from all human conditions and traditions because it possesses the quality of divine revelation. We could not speak of God if he had not revealed himself in Christ. If we tried to do so, apart from that revelation, we should be obliged to speak merely of our

own conceptions of deity. But when we speak of him in faith we mean the God who has revealed himself and who is independent of us and our thinking. Just that is the second point of significance about confessing. Confession is the affirmative answer that faith gives to revelation.

Here then we have the answer to our question as to the reason for confessional statements, our question how the simplicity of evangelical faith can be harmonized with the profundity of doctrinal statements about the Trinity. Faith does not have the doctrinal statements as its content. God himself is the content of faith, the God of whom the doctrinal statements speak. When the first article of the Augsburg Confession says that it is necessary to believe (credendum est) it does not mean the doctrinal statements themselves but the revelation of God which is affirmed in them.

V

Now we are in a position to understand Luther's attitude at the Colloquy of Marburg in 1529. The first part of the Colloquy dealt chiefly with exegetical questions. This was due to the initiative of the Swiss, although Luther was glad in this respect to follow the lead of his opponents. When Zwingli declared, according to Osiander's report of the Colloquy, "It would be a shame for us to hold such a view, to teach it and defend it, when we cannot show any passage of Scripture for it," Luther lifted the velvet cover from the table, showed him the statement, "This is my body," which he had written down with chalk, and said: "Here is our Scripture" (Weimar Edition, xxx, 147, 12 ff.).

From this incident the conclusion has often been drawn that Luther here subjected himself to a purely formal authority of the Holy Scriptures. It is said that when the great Reformer took such a stubborn stand on a single verse of Scripture he sacrificed the plain meaning and genuine message of evangelical truth. And one can frequently hear the idea which Zwingli according to one of the reports expressed at the close of the Colloquy,

namely, that Luther and his party with their peculiar view of the sacraments have set up the papacy again (159, 36).

This charge that Luther's doctrine of the Lord's Supper is a return to Catholicism is shown to be utterly without foundation when one stops to consider that Luther's position not only did not contradict his evangelical faith but on the contrary was actually a logical consequence of that faith. There can be no question as to his own views on that point. His Swiss opponents demanded a sharp separation of Christ's humanity from his deity. Zwingli claimed that Luther's doctrine of the presence of Christ's body in the Lord's Supper contradicted the statements in the Creed that he ascended to heaven and sits on the right hand of God (128, 17). These creedal statements, said Zwingli, establish a spatial separation between Christ and the Holy Supper. Oecolampadius was willing to admit that Christ was everywhere present according to his deity but he was unwilling to admit the omnipresence of his humanity (131, 18 ff.; compare the report of Brenz, 152, 32; 153, 38).

Then the report continues: "Here Oecolampadius admonished Luther not to fix his attention on the humanity and the body of Christ but to raise his vision to the deity of Christ, and in this admonition Oecolampadius spoke in derogatory terms of the humanity of Christ (humanitatem Christi plus satis extenuans)." Luther protested: "Such talk he could never endure, because he knew of no other God and would never worship any other God than the God who had become man, and he never wanted to have any other God. Moreover, there is no other God that could save a man. Therefore he could not tolerate it that the humanity of Christ should be belittled and treated in such a light manner" (132, 20 ff.; compare 157, 33). This part of the discussion lays bare the very kernel of the whole controversy.

In the discussion concerning the Person of Christ Oecolampadius demanded "ascendum esse ad divinitatem" (157, 33). But for Luther this is impossible; the very idea of man's ascent to God is an impossible idea.

It is particularly impossible if it is to be attempted by overlooking the humanity of Christ. That would simply mean that man would have to present himself before absolute deity, before the "deus non revelatus," and this is the God who must ever be to all of us a God of wrath and terror.

Luther's idea, which is confirmed in every part of the New Testament, is that it is only the God of revelation who appears as the God of grace. If we make dead earnest with that idea we must follow Luther and the New Testament in the conclusion that the God of revelation is the incarnate God, the God who in the person of his Son clothed himself in flesh and blood. Just as soon as we permit any separation to take place between God and the man Christ, the central factor in the revelation of God is destroyed. And this is by no means speculation. It is not a matter of metaphysics. On the contrary, to separate the deity of Christ from his humanity, as was demanded by the Swiss in Marburg, would mean to use speculative analysis and would completely disrupt the inner and immediate unity of faith.

So we see that it was simply on account of his faith that Luther could not agree to the assumption of his opponents. We have said that the confession is the affirmative response which faith makes to revelation. In this sense Luther and his colleagues at Marburg made a good confession. And it was a necessary confession. Strictly speaking it was a confession of the Trinity, because an insistence upon the incarnation of God in Christ is an essential element in our doctrine of a trinitarian God.

If the tenth article of the Augsburg Confession speaks only of the body and blood of Christ which are present and are distributed in the Lord's Supper that must be understood from two points of view. For one thing it was simply the use of the traditional mode of expression. But it was also a clear reference to the point at issue in the Marburg controversy. The fundamental idea is the one that was more fully developed in the later discussion concerning the ubiquity of the body of Christ. This very

statement in the tenth article of the Augsburg Confession has repeatedly furnished a handle for those who would pronounce the Lutheran view of the Lord's Supper impossible or even make it seem ridiculous. But Lutheran theologians have always clearly realized that the statement in the Confession is simply the logical consequence of Luther's statement at Marburg: "I know of no other God than the one who became man."

As there can be no humanity without corporeality, Luther and his colleagues were sure that the idea of the incarnation must include as an essential element the corporeality of Christ. And if the incarnation of God was not dissolved at the close of Christ's earthly career but through his resurrection was proved to be permanent, then it is impossible to think of the glorified Christ without corporeality, because he continued to be the God-man after his ascension. It is not merely a question of his body as such; it is a question of the unity of the person of the ascended Christ.

If now we ask whether the ubiquity of Christ's body is possible we are looking at the matter from the point of view of doubt rather than faith. Faith does not need any answer to this question because faith can never ask the question. To believe is, as we have said, to receive the forgiveness of sins from the God who has become man in Christ Jesus. How then could faith ask whether an essential element in Christ is present or not, whether an essential part of Christ can be everywhere present with God or not? It is of course nonsense to speak of "a part of Christ," but opponents compel us to do it. If a part of Christ were lacking it would not be Christ with whom we should have to do. It would not be the God of revelation. In that case there would be no faith. Only one question could have any real meaning in this connection, and that is whether it is not contrary to faith to apply a now and a here to the glorified Christ and to measure him with the temporal and spatial standards of our present form of existence.

Luther and the old Lutheran theologians held that Christ after his ascension was beyond space and time.

But the old Reformed theologians held that the account of the ascension made it necessary to conclude that Christ's body is localized. This idea the Lutherans were particularly concerned to combat. And properly so. Because the Lutherans believed that no one could find comfort in Christ's promise that he would be with us unto the end of the world unless he were convinced of the omnipresence of God. To be omnipresent means to be beyond the limitations of space. It is not as though something with spatial dimensions were occupying all space. It is like the spoken word that fills the hearts of the hearers, and this illustration Luther himself used. If the omnipresence of God is to be a comfort to us and not a thing of terror, we must realize that God is always and everywhere near us in Christ, the whole and indivisible Christ. If we realize this every time that we celebrate the Lord's supper in faith, every celebration of the Lord's Supper becomes a confession. And this is the final significance of Luther's position in Marburg that there in the theological strife he maintained the good confession.

VI

Was it really a confession to which Luther gave expression when he faced the Swiss at Marburg? A confessional writing in the ordinary sense of the word, a symbol, did not result from the Colloquy. Personal predilections had much to do with Luther's attitude. That is true not only of the Marburg Colloquy, but of all his work. For that reason our church has always declined to canonize the entire Luther. And today we still decline to canonize the "Young Luther." One of the incidental pieces of good fortune in connection with the formation of the Lutheran Confessions is the fact that it took place in such a way that the church which bears his name was saved from being bound to his person. This fact cannot be overestimated. When therefore we say that at Marburg, as in his theological work generally, Luther made a confession of faith, we use the word confession in a different sense from that in which we speak

of a confession of the church. His testimony was an affirmation of the revelation of God in Christ and for that reason it was a confession. It was a personal testimony. But we might ask whether a confession ever could be anything but a personal testimony. If it is the affirmation of faith it is a personal confession. How can a personal confession ever become a confession of the church?

The answer to this question comes in a word that frequently occurs in Luther's own testimony. It is that word "we." When he lifted that velvet cover in Marburg he did not say "This is *my* passage of Scripture," but "This is *our* passage of Scripture." That word "we" is the dominant note in all his hymns. The evangelical hymnody of the earliest times begins with a "we" that points to the evangelical congregation. The first of all of Luther's hymns begins, "A new song now *we* all shall sing, To praise the Lord *our* God." At Christmas Luther sings, "All this hath he for *us* achieved, To show how great his love." At Easter, "Christ Jesus lay in death's strong bands, For *our* offenses given." And at Whitsuntide, "Now pray *we* all the Holy Ghost." "A mighty fortress is *our* God." "Lord, keep *us* steadfast in Thy Word."

Who can doubt that the faith which here comes to expression is a very personal faith. And yet that which speaks and sings in these hymns is something more than the individual personality; it is the evangelical congregation. It is the church which speaks and sings. These hymns of Luther are just as much a confession of the great articles on the divine majesty as are our ecclesiastical symbols. Just for that reason, however, they are no mere testimony of individuals. As purely literary products, as samples of religious lyrics, they are nothing but toys for those who are interested in philology and aesthetics. They have no real life until a congregation begins to sing them. An individual has written them down, but in reality they express what the congregation believes and confesses. It is entirely proper that they should not say "I" and "me," but "we" and "us."

Thus we see that it is not quite right to ask how the testimony of an individual can become the confession of the church. One does not grow out of the other as though the man of faith used his confession to make propaganda among other men. The thing that really works and produces results is not the confession but the "high faith in the divine majesty": God, the Father of Jesus Christ, the Holy Spirit who proceeds from the Father and bears witness of Christ. This Spirit who proceeds from the Father and bears witness of Christ speaks to me but does not speak through me. The act of receiving this revelation is an act of individual personality, but that which is received by no means individual.

Now the confession, which is faith's affirmation to revelation, is not a testimony concerning my act of receiving the revelation. It is a testimony concerning that which is received, that is, concerning him who is revealed and proclaimed to us. Thus it is involved in the very nature of a confession that it transcends individual personality and pertains to a congregation of believers. For, while the Word of revelation is indeed valid for me as an individual, nevertheless it applies to the whole world and is intended for the church. That Word has brought forth the church and from that Word the church ever and anon is born anew. Whoever therefore believes that Word and confesses it, thereby is included in the church. He belongs to the "we" of the confessing church. He can count himself a member of the church that confesses and sings in unison: "We all believe in one true God, of heaven and earth Creator." By joining in that confession he gives expression to the fact that he does belong to the church.

Thus the Confession gains new significance. It is the symbol of unity in the church. The first article of the Augsburg Confession begins: "In the first place we hold and teach in unity." It is the purpose of the confessors to express the "magnus consensus" with reference to the great articles of the divine majesty. "It is sufficient for the true unity of the Christian churches," says the

seventh article, "that the Gospel be preached in its purity and that the Sacraments be administered according to God's Word."

The unity of the church is not produced by the confession any more than the church itself is produced by the confession. It is the effect of the unity of the Holy Spirit whose Word produced the church. But the church, which is entrusted with the Word, has also the responsibility of proclaiming it. Thus it becomes a teaching church. And history teaches that whenever this is the case there is a possibility of diversity and even a danger of confusion. That is involved in the very nature of the case. For in order to teach, a person must speak. And as soon as a man speaks his language glides into channels that lead him across the terrible bottoms of human incapacity and human sin. Error and sin are stirred up and mixed in with the stream of thought and language. Therefore it is always necessary for the church to fight for the purity and truth of its message. In this struggle the confession is the symbol that binds together those who teach in unity.

Thus the circle is closed. For in this struggle against error and confusion the confession again sets forth the claim that faith makes upon the church. But at the same time this claim is grounded on the fact and limited by the fact that the confession is nothing but the affirmative response that faith makes to revelation. It is grounded on that fact because the confession itself rests upon the transcendent claim of divine revelation. It is limited by that fact because every human affirmation is relative and conditioned. We cannot by an act of our wills get rid of the historical conditions that attach to the Apostles' Creed. Nor can we simply think out of existence the historical circumstances that condition the Augsburg Confession. It was conditioned by the occasion that gave rise to it, conditioned by the character of the church whose reform it demanded, conditioned also by the limitations that rest upon all human theological thinking and teaching.

If in spite of such limitations and conditions we never-

theless find ourselves at one with the confessors of Marburg and Augsburg and unite with them in their confession as a "magnus consensus," it is not because we ascribe to their confession a sort of divine authority. That would make our loyalty to the Confession a sort of idolatry. Rather do we unite with them in their confession because our faith like theirs is simply an affirmative response to the same great articles of the divine majesty which they confessed.

VIII

This seems to us to be the relation between the faith and the confession of the church in the light of Marburg and Augsburg. How will they appear to future generations in the light of Copenhagen? This council of the evangelical churches of the Augsburg Confession has one advantage over the great gatherings of the last few years in which delegations from the most varied churches were gathered together. We have a common confession. This and nothing else is the symbol of our unity. This council of Copenhagen has not met for the purpose of searching for unity. This council assumes that unity exists.

And yet it would be a dangerous error if we were to be satisfied with a merely formal and legal acknowledgment of the confessions in our churches. The "magnus consensus" implied in our confessional act can only constitute a real and valid bond of union among our churches if it is really the affirmative answer of faith to the revelation of God. We must be actuated not by reverence for the fathers of our church who lived and labored in 1529 and 1530 but solely by reverence for the God of revelation.

That brings us once more to face squarely the fundamental question of the Reformation: Is your church, you men of the council of Copenhagen, is your church such as the great articles of the divine majesty would require? Only if we are in dead earnest with this question does the Confession accomplish its chief purpose, namely, to lay upon the church the demand for evangelical faith.

The Roman church at the Vatican Council of 1870 accepted the dogma that the decisions of the Pope are irreformable. Irreformable is a terrible word if applied to the statements or deeds of a man! For the church it means the absolute rejection of any kind of reformation for all future time. We on our part, if we are to be related by our faith to the confessors of Marburg and Augsburg, must regard every word of man, every ogranization of the church, every constitution, every form of worship, as reformable. Only one thing is irreformable for us and that is the revelation of God.

THE LUTHERAN CHURCH AND THE SOCIAL CRISIS

J. MARONI
OSLO, NORWAY

It has always been the glory of the Christian church that it has had an eye and a heart for all who need, the young and weak, the helpless and oppressed, and has regarded their protection against wrong and want as its most solemn duty. To such a work the church is called by the Gospel of Christ, and so far as the church is living and active it will be diligent in fulfilling this most important mission. Should the spirit of worldliness increase among Christians their concern for those in need will decrease. The earnestness and ability in performing this work of charity has varied at different times, but the work has never disappeared from the life of the church. Had it done so, church life itself would have disappeared, for such a work is necessary for the church's very existence. That old monk was right when he called the poor "The Jewels of the Church." Pointing to them, Jesus said, "The poor ye have always with you." "Inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these my brethren ye have done it unto me." For the sake of the church as well as for those who suffer, that work of charity must be ever regarded as an imperative duty.

The church's aim in this respect is not merely to carry out the individual concrete charitable undertakings according to the needs of the time. It is much more than that. It is to maintain the high ethical claim of Christian faith and love in all human relations, so that the church stands as the awakened conscience of the community, working the fundamental law of Christian love into the opinions of the people, in civil legislation, and in social life, and substituting for egoism the rule of love according to the Scriptures, "Ye all are brethren."

In this way the church does more than merely relieve want and alleviate suffering; it creates a Christian

opinion with regard to morality, legislation and social responsibility. Christian philanthropy is a supporter of the church in proclaiming the Gospel of Christ,—her chief aim in the world. The life of the Christian is the Bible of the world, and it is often the only one that is read. Works of charity in themselves are a proclamation of the Gospel, not it may be, in word, but in deed, and in a way that all can see and understand. Through this means many souls are drawn to the Lord whom these goodhearted Christians serve, who moves them by this spirit to such acts of kindness and to follow his example, "who went about doing good." For this reason such good work must always be a necessary and integral part of the life of the Christian church. This, however, has not at all times in the church's history been clearly recognized.

If we study the period immediately preceding the Lutheran reformation it must be acknowledged that in this respect the church was very strong. Therefore in spite of all else the church of the middle ages occupied a very powerful position. That, of course, may be due to various reasons, but not least among them was the importance attached to so-called "good works." To the honor of the church at that period it must be admitted that it performed an exceedingly great and good social work in the spirit of Christian faith and love, and produced many bright and noble characters, who, at great personal risk, defended the weak against the oppression and injustice of the mighty, and who shrank not from making the greatest personal sacrifices.

But at that same time, with this good work, and in it, the church had one great weakness namely, in its motives. People had gradually fallen into the error of believing that a Christian by his own good works could create for himself a righteousness before God, could atone for, and pay the price for his sins, and could earn God's grace and good will. Good works were given such an important place that the work of Christ's salvation was left in the background. The very foundation of salvation was removed. People sought for peace, and assurance of salva-

tion through something in their own works, a foundation altogether too frail and insufficient on which to build. By that way no awakened conscience could obtain peace. However much one did, however obedient one might be to the church's commands, all fell short of attaining what the soul needed. Even the best were imperfect, stained with sin, very weak, and no good works could wash away a single sin. It is sad to think of those poor souls who in vain sought to obtain peace by means of gifts, through a monastic life, through poverty and through different kinds of works of charity, not to mention the many other strange forms of holy works to which in their need the people turned.

Luther, the father of our church, first sought most earnestly in this way to obtain peace, and did all he could, but in vain. He found that more was necessary. And this became quite clear to him when, with the help and guidance of the Scriptures and the Creed, he saw that great central evangelical truth that had so long been overshadowed, that man is justified by faith alone, without the works of the law. This is the beating heart in the Lutheran reformation. In the experience of this truth, and in its proclamation, the Lutheran church returned to the Scriptures, to the first Christian community, to the primitive church, where a Paul, and later on an Augustine, with radiant clearness held up this truth before the eyes of Christians. Through this, the clear evangelical light of the Gospel fell on the form of the Saviour himself and on his work of salvation, finished, once for all, and wherein alone is salvation and peace, assurance and life eternal.

This teaching, quite naturally, produced a reaction among Lutheran Christians against the one-sided emphasis on good works and their importance. People were afraid of Christ being again relegated to the background. It was by no means easy for all to put good works immediately in their proper place as a fruit and effect of justification before God, instead of a root and cause. A time therefore came when a great falling off in zeal for good

works was evident. It was not the fault of Luther, the father of the church. His views were clear and healthy on this point. But, surrounded on all sides, as people were, by Roman Catholic "holy works" expressed in such a horrible way as in the sale of indulgences, it was not to be wondered at that people tried to divide inward Christian faith from outward Christian activity of life, in a way that was not at all warranted, when their true relationship is taken into consideration. But little heed was given to the truth in the epistle of St. James, "Show one thy faith by thy works." The faith that is not active in good works is a dead faith.

When, however, the principle of the Lutheran Reformation—justification by faith—had become recognized and had entered so deeply into the consciousness of the church that it might be considered for all time secure, then the healthy Christian life which that truth created expressed itself in clear views regarding the importance of works of charity and of the whole ethical life. People would not and could not make the doctrine of justification by faith into a soft pillow on which to doze in Christian passivity. Gradually it became evident that the duty to perform good works, and also the inner longing and desire thereto, was not dead but had created for itself new ways of expression that were far more valuable than the old works of charity, inasmuch as they were born of nobler motives.

And on this foundation development has gradually proceeded with a continually increasing Christian activity, so that the church and its contribution to social welfare has become with time an indispensable factor in the life of the people, directly and indirectly. The church has become the great and good mother of the people, and it has founded and organized institutions that have been able effectively to take up the work of relieving all sorts of social need. A very bright side of the life of the Lutheran church appears, as from the standpoint of church history we observe the church's emphasis on this duty, and the many social movements it has initiated and developed to greater and greater perfection.

From the first such work was done by societies. We think of such a society as Home missions, a movement intended not only to proclaim the words of the Gospel but also to help by works of charity, a movement through which the inner craving for Christian activity found scope and satisfaction. Nursing for the poor is provided, homes for deaconesses and institutions for deacons are built, hospitals are erected, homes for children, homes for the aged, homes for epileptics, institutions for the disabled and defectives, rescue homes for fallen women, homes for drunkards, and all such like undertakings. People will understand that no institution is able to face these great tasks, fulfill them in the right spirit, and create real homes as the Christian church. Not only from a spiritual point of view, but also from a purely economic standpoint the church is able to perform this work as no other body can. When we see the extraordinarily great sustaining power of the voluntary principle we have courage to take up still bigger tasks. And with this work, and indeed from it, the church grows spiritually and Christianity itself reaps great advantage, for all good work brings some gain and has its reward in itself.

In this century especially, by the side of united organized philanthropic work, there has also been an energetic progressive development of a parochial character. It is something more than the parceling out of the whole labor into small groups that are practicable and easily managed, though this of course is of immense importance for the real effectiveness of the church's activity in helping people. It consists rather in a keener appreciation of the fact that it is the duty of all Christians to take part therein, and that it is not merely the hobby of a little flock of church people, keenly interested in affairs of the parish, and joined together in some society, but it is the work of the churches as a whole. The church itself is the active head of all the work and brings its rich spiritual resources into it.

We have nursing and other parochial institutions, as a home for babies, children's nurseries, children's hospi-

tals, day-homes and holiday settlements; we have homes for the aged and arrangements for the care of hard-worked, worn out mothers, homes for recreation and for convalescents, and such like institutions, all organized by the parish. In order more easily to carry out some greater undertaking, as providing a home for incurables, a number of parishes unite together. We try to awaken the feeling of parochial responsibility in all the living members of the parish, and to move them to take part in and support all such philanthropic work of the church.

There is no opposition between the parochial form of labor and that adopted by societies. On the contrary they go forward, hand in hand as brothers, mutually supporting each other. But the development of parochial methods of working is of great importance, in that it gives the whole work distinctly a church character and a wide horizon.

But with this extended horizon there come in view the great tasks that still are waiting for the church to take up. I am thinking of the whole social development of human society. No man can be blind to the fact that society, as we have it today, is in a very unhealthy condition, and suffers from very serious imperfections that bring us face to face with the most difficult problems. There are evils of poverty and unemployment, house shortage, the war, class warfare, and mammonism. Men are striving with feverish zeal to find remedies for these ills.

But it is asked, has the church, as a church, anything to do with such things? Must they not be brought to the notice of politicians and left to their efforts? No, we cannot so easily pass by these great difficulties. Politics are good and useful when their aim is true and right, and politicians are indispensable, however difficult it may be at times to have anything to do with them. But as a rule, politicians are the representatives of a single party, they advocate and pursue a one-sided point of view and adopt a partial biased attitude. But the church stands outside and over all political parties. It is not merely a social reformer in the outward meaning of that term,

and it must guard against becoming the servant of a single party. And yet to these great and difficult questions it can bring a great and positive contribution, by maintaining justice and right, charity and unselfishness, by attackng public and social sins with the sword of the spirit,—the word of God,—and by pointing to that glorious goal in the future, the Lord himself has pictured for us, "When swords will be turned into plowshares and spears into pruninghooks," and no one will spoil his neighbour, when all people will live together and as Christians should, when God's will becomes the law of all, and in his will all people find their peace and happiness.

It is in this domain of social reform that the greatest difficulties are met. All parties would have the church on their side and demand that it shall serve their interests, regarded from their own one-sided point of view, and should the church refuse to do this it is opposed, ridiculed and despised. The church must not allow itself to be disturbed by such treatment. It has one law to follow—that law of love. It has one will to obey—God's will. It has one kingdom to fight for—God's kingdom. It labors for the temporal and eternal welfare of all who submit to God's law, become citizens of his kingdom and serve God and man in love. It will keep its ideals bright and definite, displaying them to all men, and it will strive to arouse the consciences of all with the cry, "Brethren divide the inheritance in a brotherly way." Here it would take too long to go into all the different social problems which are actual in our time, and enter into debate with regard to what the church should fight for in every single case. On these matters opinions differ widely, as the various countries and their conditions are unlike. Discussions, of course, there may be concerning the best means to obtain the end, and they are not always and everywhere the same, but the end itself is one—the kingdom of God—and a faithful and unselfish, a confident and fearless effort towards this end on the part of the church will never be in vain.

In preventive work, the work that aims at hindering

the corruption of the people and whatever concerns them, there is still a wide field of labor, demanding the serious thought and effort of the living, working church. "Prevention is better than cure." For this reason the church must always be most energetic in the cause of temperance. It must take up the fight against all the pitfalls that are set to catch the feet of the young, must condemn prostitution in every form, must protest against the slackness with regard to marriage and the sacredness of its views, attack the selfish code of business and commerce, stop the brazen, shameless advertisement of sin of every kind. It must never be weary in trying to remove stones of stumbling from the path of the people, however frequently and contemptuously its action may be resented. It is called to fill the place of a mother in the great home of the people and must be content with the treatment a mother receives. She is so often put aside with the rebuke, "This is something you do not understand, and with which you must not meddle." But when the mother's heart is really warm, her eye becomes clear and her intuition highly developed, concerning what harms or helps. The politicians, who consider themselves the fathers of the people, may shrug their shoulders at the church's activity, but the church knows one who is greater than they, the Father of all, and does not turn aside from its course. And how often in the household the mother, apparently of very little account, becomes after all, and in the long run the greatest influence in the home. She works with the growing family, and in young hearts sows the good seed, and love, the greatest power of all. The principles and ideas for which the church contends will exercise their quiet, strong influence on everything, on all people and in all relationships.

In this way the church with its high ideals and its self-sacrificing service will be the mother of true progress, trusting in him who guides the fortunes of the people, hears prayers, blesses all work done in sincere love and who can make all things work together for good for those who fear, love and serve him.

The constitution of the church or the constitution of

the state are subordinate matters. The life-bringing message and the life-advancing work, in the end, are decisive and for this the Lutheran church with its pure evangelical teaching, its genius for practical work, its motives and high ideals has the greatest qualifications.

May our church take up its work, and with God's blessing continue it, with ever increasing insight and ability from generation to generation.

THE LUTHERAN CHURCH AND THE SOCIAL CRISIS

LOUIS APPIA
PARIS, FRANCE

What you doubtless expect of me is a short exposition of how the problem before us appears to a church which is not so important numerically as those of Europe or America, but a limited community like our Lutheran church in France. You know that our church is a minority within a minority. In our country the Protestants include only about one-fortieth of the whole population, and the Lutherans only about one per cent.

The situation of the Lutherans, between the two great opposing bodies, the Catholic and the indifferent or hostile mass, compels them to co-operate cordially on social questions and in many other respects with the other evangelical churches. French Protestants can only exist and maintain their principles among our people if they unite among themselves in Christian fraternity. That is perhaps the first fact, peculiar to our minority churches, which calls for remark.

What can I now tell you that will add a really useful and perhaps distinctive note to that which you have already heard from our brethren of Norway and Austria?

The Lutheran church of France includes, besides Alsace with two hundred parishes, two other groups: the diocese of Montbéliard, with forty-five parishes, and the diocese of Paris with about twenty parishes. Having insufficient information about Montbéliard, and especially about Alsace, I am not qualified to describe the attitude they take with reference to the social crisis. Not wishing, however, to seem to ignore them, I shall refer to them briefly. As to the region of Montbéliard I quote from a letter received from Rev. Vurpillot, the ecclesiastical inspector:

> In spite of the "Quietisme" which is the weakness of Lutheran piety, I think that, by reason of its own principles, our church is admirably situated for action in the social field. It has an or-

ganic and social idea of the church, which is not a free society, but, according to the conception of St. Paul, an organic body, a spiritual family. That is why our industrial families of Montbéliard, actuated by this principle, which they owe to their Lutheran training, are distinguished by their interest in social action, and hold perhaps the first rank in France as concerns their care for the material and moral as well as the spiritual welfare of their workmen. They found societies for mutual help of all sorts, giving old-age pensions and making grants to societies for music and sports and they establish kindergartens, hospitals, old people's homes, orphanages, homes for babies, foundling asylums, dispensaries, schools for sick nurses and domestic economy, associations for the protection of orphans and the poor, fraternities, social lectures, etc.

Owing to the numerical importance of the Lutheran church in Alsace, it naturally has social organisations of the same kind on a much larger scale. I have been perusing a long record of such enterprises. Having too little time to speak of them, I simply mention the splendid deaconesses' institutions: the Home at Strasbourg, founded by Pastor Haerter, that of Neuenberg at Ingwiller, founded by Pastor Hermann, and that of Sarepta, founded in 1903 at Dorlisheim by Pastor Ziegelmeyer.

The Lutheran church in Paris has also produced fruit in social institutions: inner missions, diaconates, a benevolent association with parochial branches, orphanages, homes for the aged, a training-school for nurses, an association for apprentices, a loan society, etc.

Finally, there is a work that is common to all three groups of our church, which it would be unjust to forget. It is a great piece of social work done in affiliation with the other denominations: the fight against intemperance. The Blue-Cross Societies and Bands of Hope exist in Paris, and are prosperous in Montbéliard and in Alsace. Their cradle was the vigorous Lutheran center at Valentigney near Montbéliard. Their central French committee was presided over at different times by three Lutheran pastors, P. Dieterlen, J. Meyer, and Auguste Schaffner. Schaffner, who was secretary of the Inner Mission, also

did useful social work among the workmen's population of Saint Denis, the socialist suburb of Paris.

Having said this in order to relate the social action of our church to the contemporary current, we must consider the principles and the history of which the efforts of today and tomorrow are the continuation and development.

As an interesting reference to thinkers who in no wise belong to Protestantism, I may mention the fact that Jaurès, the most renowned of French socialist leaders, had recognised the social value of Luther's principles and entitled his Latin thesis: *De primis socialismi germanici lineamentis apud Lutherum, Kant, etc.*

Our church, however small it may be, can show some good results in service. Two or three pages of history, briefly sketched, will transport us, one into a rural district of France, another into the heart of a workmen's quarter in Paris, a third into the very soul of a noble initiator of social Christianity. For the first example, I shall limit myself to a simple silhouette, a striking episode of Christian activity in a Lutheran parish of agricultural laborers, who were formerly very poor and very ignorant. I refer to Oberlin, the reformer of Ban de la Roche, in the Vosges.[1] Between 1767 and 1826, he accomplished in a region, remote from any large center and at that time half savage, a social work of improved education and religious progress. He transformed his vast parish, and earned the attention and admiration of his contemporaries and of posterity for his personality and methods. Granted that he had predecessors like Stuber and others, and helpers like his wife, his faithful servant Louise Scheppler, his son Henri, still it was he who was the instigator of this long effort of social transformation. In 1767 he had found his large parish in a state of great misery, without means of communication from one village to another, or with the world outside, almost deprived of means of instruction, without any interest in

1 Leenhardt, Camille, *Jean Frédéric Oberlin.* Nancy: Berger Levraultt, 1911.

God's reign in the world and without any industry which permitted the agriculturists to utilize their winter leisure. At his death he left the parish provided with all these privileges under the efficient influence of living Christianity, with healthful dwellings, with schools, with halls and with institutions in full growth. We are obliged to omit here all details about his religious, social and pedagogical activity. But we must insist on the direct Christian inspiration of his work, on his intrepid faith even in the dark days of the Terror and on the influence, both social and religious, which radiated from this Lutheran center in the Vosges. And if anyone thinks that by referring to these distant memories we show ourselves strangers to modern social problems, we reply by quoting an event which dates from September 2, 1928. On that day, Mr. Albert-Thòmas, director of the International Labor Office at Geneva, went to Oberlin's parish to preside at the inauguration of a commemorative tablet in memory of Daniel Legrand, manufacturer at Fouday, who is recognized as the initiator of the modern project of the international organization of labor. The Legrands, originally from Basle, were members of the Reformed church, but the father of Daniel, called by Oberlin, became his friend and co-worker and settled with his family at Ban de la Roche. His son Daniel owed to the environment of this little place, lost in the mountains, part of the social orientation which made him a prophet of one of the most important organizations of modern times.

Our second picture is the activity of Pastor Louis Meyer[2] in Paris from 1837 to 1867. Here we see the French Lutheran church at work in a big city and in a particularly poor and miserable workmen's district.

A witness from the Reformed church, M. Babut, the well-known pastor of Nimes, has written: "The development of this church in Paris, between the end of the First Empire and 1870 is something marvelous; leaving aside the early days of Christianity we do not know whether

2 *Louis Meyer. Sa vie, son oeuvre.* Paris: Monnerat 48 rue de Lille, 1886.

any church, at any time, in any country, has made more rapid progress." This development in numbers is not what interests us here. What is valuable from the point of view of social action in a time of crisis, is that in a period of great industrial expansion, when Paris by including the suburbs within its walls doubled its size and population, the men who directed and served the Lutheran church recognized the gravity of the moment, and organised, with admirable energy, a religious, charitable, educational effort among a population of immigrants whose number surpassed all expectations. Louis Meyer, ecclesiastical inspector and president of the Consistory from 1857 to 1867, was the inspirer and principal agent of this transformation, which, in spite of all kinds of difficulties, increased the number of pastors from three to twenty-one, and multiplied the number of parishes five times. He was aided by gifted men like the Vallettes, the Bergers, the Goguels, and German pastors like Beyer and Bodelschwingh. It was an admirable effort, which saved innumerable families from indifference and often from degradation: those who had come in crowds from Alsace and Germany and who were soon absorbed in the French population.

The various aspects of his work, undertaken especially in the poorest parts of Paris, deserve mention. In the districts of St. Marcel and La Villette, the "French and German Mission" was started. Day-schools were opened in many places, preceding the communal schools. For there, as elsewhere, the Protestants, and especially the Lutheran church, faithful to the tradition of the Reformers, considered that instruction opened the way at the same time to social progress and religious development. We find the group of institutions of St. Marcel at that time in full activity. They included the day-schools, kindergartens, boarding schools, etc. Let us also mention old people's homes, and the home for artisans, which protects many apprentices and young workmen in the critical hours of their lives.

But among the undertakings, one which claims special attention is the "Society of Friends of the Poor," a

"school of prophets," as it has been called, the favorite child of L. Meyer, to which for a long time he gave the best of his Christian thought and biblical energy, associating with the impulse of Christian benevolence an intense spiritual activity to preserve isolated young people from the dangers of a big city and to lead them to the Saviour. There, John Bost, the French Bodelschwingh, quitting his musical career, heard God's call, which led him later to found the admirable institution of Laforce. Some of those men who later at Ban de la Roche distinguished themselves as Christian employers anxious for social justice and solidarity lit their torch at this flame: Gustave Steinheil, Louis Fallot, and especially Christopher Dieterlen. The last mentioned created no charitable organization, but he had a wonderful spiritual influence. He was the inspirer, sometimes the guide, of the man who was to become in France the initiator of Social Christianity, Tommy Fallot.[3]

This personality of Tommy Fallot is the third silhouette which we wish to sketch. He completed his career as pastor in the Reformed church at Aouste (Drôme) and he ministered in Paris in the Free church, but his character and his thought were rooted in the Lutheran church, where his youth was formed. He was pastor of Rothau from 1872 to 1876, after having given his first years to industry helping his father, Louis Fallot. Even if today the men whose names are best known as leaders of the Protestant social movement belong to the Reformed church, it was due to the influence of Tommy Fallot that in 1887 there was formed the Association for the Practical Study of Social Questions, the germ of the movement. It was he who inspired Louis Gouth, Chastand, Paul Minault, and, later, Henry Nick, Wilfred Monod and Elie Gounelle. His was a strong personality, ardent and easily discouraged. He was "led," as he himself said, "to the confines of atheism and anarchy," but he was sober and well-balanced by contact with reality and social prob-

3 Boegner, Marc, *Tommy Fallot.* 2 Vols., 1914 and 1926. Paris: Fischbacher.

lems, by inner experience and by weakness and suffering.

Prepared by his career as manufacturer and by his professional work among the workmen at Chemnitz, Elberfeld, Manchester, and at Ban de la Roche to understand social distress, to suffer from it, and to seek a remedy, he as pastor in Paris, succeeded in gaining the confidence of certain centers of proletarianism and of certain socialist leaders. He threw himself into the contest, in spite of the terror of many of his friends, causing his parish to take a sympathetic attitude toward his movement. He organized groups for study and action, and worked with the McAll Mission in the most miserable centers.

Under the inspiration of Josephine Butler he took active part in the abolitionist campaign of the British Federation against Legal Prostitution, extending it so as to include improvement in the condition of all women. He founded the French League for the Reform of Public Morality, appreciating the intimate link between this question and that of the whole social question, i. e. all forms of oppression and misery.

The exhaustion brought on by the excessive work, the long and tedious period of rest which was imposed on him, and his meditation during this time of inaction, contributed to his development. Leaving others who were less tired, or younger, in charge of the work he had undertaken (courses of lectures, etc.) he felt moved to begin his pastoral work again, simply, but on broad lines. He found in the church parish, humble or even fallen as it may have been, the chosen field for the action of the Spirit of God. He considered, as he said, "the conversion of one soul as having more social value than the opening of a new railway line," and devoted his remaining strength from 1893 to 1904, in the midst of heavy bereavement and great physical suffering, to his beloved parish. All the while he remained the friend and animator of those who followed the path which he had marked out.

Has not the description of these experiences and the final conviction of a man who sometimes said he was a more faithful Lutheran than many who ministered in

Lutheran churches led us to feel the unity of inspiration of the social Christian movement in France, and realize the link which connects the principles of its initiator, T. Fallot, with those of Oberlin and Louis Meyer, both of whom influenced him so deeply through the religious center of Ban de la Roche and especially through Christopher Dieterlen? We recognize also by his social experiences the fundamental difference between materialist socialism and the Christian social effort wherein material and social progress—necessary as it is—remains simply a means for the spiritual growth of man and mankind. So we are led to the very core of our subject: the Gospel of Christ—and the Gospel in its Lutheran form—in relation to the social crisis.

The three servants of God whose silhouettes we have sketched have each in their way done social work in France. For none of them was this activity a foreign element added to their ministry. On the contrary it was the normal outcome, belonging organically to the inspiration of their pastoral activity, according to their conception of the church and of divine work in the soul. Whether by action or thought it was on the road of direct service for souls and for the reign of God that they saw their task extend. Thus they saw their ministry becoming concrete and the spiritual descending to the temporal so as to raise the temporal to the level of the spiritual.

Certain conceptions of Christian social action are apt to focus the realization of the kingdom of God on the improvement of external conditions. With these three men, —and with other leaders—the plan was reversed. And is not this outer activity as the direct outcome of an inner spiritual life, "which is more moral when more spiritual, more social when more mystic," precisely one of the distinctive features of the Lutheran idea of God's kingdom?

MEDIEVAL LIBRARIES

O. L. SCHREIBER
ONEONTA, N. Y.

Medieval libraries, in most instances, are libraries connected with monasteries or abbeys. They are an essential part of every monastic institution, for without books there was danger that the monks would relapse into barbarism. The monasteries were thus the great institutions which contributed more than anything else to preserve the scattered remnants of the learning of the classical period. The libraries of the monasteries were the storerooms where books were preserved, and therefore great importance was attached to them: "A monastery without a library is a fort without an armory." Especially the monasteries of Western Europe that were identified with the Rule of St. Benedict were the possessors of great and famous libraries.

In Egypt, where the monastic idea originated, the monasteries identified with the Rule of St. Pachomius possessed libraries. We learn of them from St. Pachomius' Rule and the ascetic writings of Cassian, who was the first to introduce the rules of Eastern monasticism into the West. Using this Rule as a guide for our information, we learn "that the books of the House (monastery) are to be kept in a cupboard (finestra) in the thickness of the wall. Any brother who wanted a book might have one for a week, at the end of which he was bound to return it. No brother might leave a book open when he went to church or to meals. In the evening the officer called "the Second," that is, the second in command, was to take charge of the books, count them, and lock them up."[1]

The monasteries identified with the Order of St. Benedict were in reality the nurseries of learning throughout the Dark Ages. Love of learning was one of the distinc-

1 J. W. Clark, *The Care of Books*, p. 54; Butler, *Palladius*, p. 234.

tive features of this great monastic order. Their libraries were regulated by the Rule which Benedict, who encouraged and enforced reading, and who manifested a special care for books and their preservation, laid down.

IMPORTANT MEDIEVAL LIBRARIES

The monastic libraries connected with the Benedictine order were numerous. It will therefore be necessary to mention only the most important. In point of time, the Benedictine abbeys of Wearmouth and Jarrow, both in England, claim our attention. These two monasteries were built by the same person and were located at Durham. They were so closely connected in their early history that they were often spoken of as one; but they are in reality about six or seven miles apart. The founder of these two abbeys was Benedict Biscop. It is said that Biscop brought workmen from France to build them and his church at Wearmouth according to the Roman style, and that he furnished the church with glass windows. This luxury was hitherto unknown in England. Pictures and service-books were also introduced into the church. Accordingly, it may be said that this abbey was the cradle of English art and literature. The Venerable Bede received his early education there. Bede tells us what he himself had seen of Benedict Biscop. He relates that Biscop went to Rome in 671 and "brought home not a few books of all-divine erudition, either bought for a fixed price or given him by the kindness of friends; and when on his return he came to Vienne he received those which he had bought and entrusted to his friends there."[2] We are told that in 678 Biscop paid another visit to Rome and "brought home a multitude of books of every kind." Biscop gave directions in his last days that the very noble and complete library which he had brought from Rome as necessary for the instruction of the church, should be scrupulously preserved entire and neither suffer injury through want of care nor be dispersed.[3] The books which

2 *Hist. Abbat., IV.*
3 *Hist. Abbat., XI.*

Biscop had collected were divided between Wearmouth and Jarrow.

Biscop, the first abbot, was succeeded by Ceolfrid (642-716), and under these two and their successors the abbeys flourished for 200 years. Bede, who was in the abbey when Ceolfrid was abbot, has described the character and work of the man. "This last (Ceolfrid) was himself a man of most extraordinary diligence and superior quickness of apprehension; prompt in carrying into effect but prudent in forming designs and unrivalled in piety." During this long administration Ceolfrid brought to a happy conclusion all the admirable plans for promoting piety which his distinguished predecessor had begun. Time also suggested and enabled him to carry into execution numerous improvements of his own. Amongst a great variety of these, we ought particularly to notice that he considerably augmented the number of private oratories or chapels of ease; added eagerly to the plate and sacred vestments of the church, and with an ardour which equalled the past energy of Benedict in founding, he nearly doubled the libraries of both his monasteries. Besides innumerable other literary acquisitions he procured three pandects of the new, added to one of the old translations of the Bible which he had brought from Rome. In his later days, departing again for that city, he took with him as a donative one of these three valued volumes, leaving to his monasteries the other two."[4]

This volume which he brought with him to Rome is the famous Codex Amiatinus. He presented it to the Roman pontiff and thus Ceolfrid amply repaid the libraries of Rome for the books which he and Biscop had received from them for his libraries at Wearmouth and Jarrow. This codex is now in the Laurentian Library in Florence and has been described as "perhaps the finest book in the world."[5] De Rossi concluded that it was written at Wearmouth and Jarrow between the years 690 and 716, and that it was one of the three copies of St. Jerome's

4 *Hist. Abbat., XV.*
5 White, in *Studia Biblica, II, 273.*

Vulgate. Although produced at Wearmouth as suggested, it, nevertheless, does not seem to have been the work of English scribes, but of Italian brought over to England.

In 680 the abbeys suffered greatly from the Danes, but both were restored, though not to their former independence. In 1545 "all the house and scite of the late cell of Wearmouth" valued at about £ 26 yearly were granted by Henry VIII to Thomas Whitehead, a relative of Prior Whitehead of Durham, who resigned that monastery in 1540. He became the first Protestant dean.

At York a cathedral school was founded by Archbishop Egbert. This prelate and Bede were great friends, as well as Ceolfrid, and through Egbert the library at Wearmouth must have influenced Alcuin greatly. Alcuin entered the cathedral school at York when a mere child. After the founder's death the duty of directing the school devolved upon the scholarly Alcuin. For fifteen years he devoted his energies to the work of the school and through his influence a great body of students were attracted. He made great efforts to enrich the already valuable library at the abbey connected with the school. Part of Alcuin's educational work at York consisted in caring for and preserving as well as enlarging its precious library. We know that he travelled through Europe several times, and that on these journeys he was busy copying books and collecting them. A valuable description of the academic life at York, as well as a list of the authors whose names were in the catalogue of the library is given us in a poem, written by Alcuin before he left England, entitled "On the Saints of the Church at York." In this poem he describes the course of studies as "liberal studies and the holy word," i. e., the seven liberal arts and the study of the Scriptures and the Fathers. The list of authors in the poem included, besides the best known Latin Fathers, also some of the Greek Fathers—Athanasius, Basil and Chrysostom. The works of historians, grammarians, philosophers and of Latin classical writers were found in the library.

Alcuin visited Rome and on his way home he met Charlemagne at Parma in March 781. This ruler urged him to abide with him in France, and to take up his residence at the royal court as "Master of the Palace School." This school was located most of the time at Aachen; but as often as the Emperor changed his residence the school followed. At the age of sixty, Alcuin desired to withdraw from the world; so Charlemagne appointed him abbot of St. Martin's at Tour. This seems to have been the right place for him. Here he worked indefatigably and made all efforts to set up a model monastic school. He gathered books for the school and succeeded in drawing students from all over Europe, from Italy, Germany, England and Ireland. It was his work as scholar and educator which gave Alcuin the merit of being the first in the movement for the revival of learning which was taking place at that period. There can be no question that, on account of the advances made by him in education, Charlemagne made provision, in 789, for the erection of schools for boys at the cathedrals and episcopal churches. Henceforth, Western Europe received a stimulus in the erection of schools and libraries.

Of the famous libraries in Germany and Switzerland, and those which rose to great importance through Charlemagne's support, were those at St. Gall, Reichenau, Corvey, Sponheim and Fulda.

At first the abbey of St. Gall was under the influence of Columban and Irish missionaries. Gotzbert, the abbot, set about the erection of a magnificent church and the enlargement of the library at the abbey. He secured many new manuscripts, and employed the brethren to multiply copies of them. Grimald, his successor, followed in his footsteps and enlarged the library. A catalogue, still extant, was drawn up during his abbacy, and shows what a great variety of subjects were in the archives. St. Gall still has possession of over 400 manuscripts mentioned in that catalogue. The invasion of the Huns threatened the destruction of the abbey and its library. To secure a place of safety for books, Engelbert, a later abbot, had

the most valuable manuscripts and books removed to Reichenau. In 937 the monastery was almost entirely destroyed by fire; fortunately, the library escaped.

Nothing definite can be said about the library during the Dark Ages. From the fourteenth century onward its lot has been a varied one. First, the Humanists were allowed to take away some of the choicest specimens of the classical manuscripts. It does not appear that they were ever returned. St. Gall's location in Switzerland brought the library in contact with the Calvinists during the sixteenth century. As in the churches, so in the monasteries, the Calvinists tried to effect reformation by throwing everything out. The monastery was raided and the most valuable books were scattered. After this the library was once more restored but, in 1712, it was pillaged by the Swiss and its books scattered; only a portion of these were restored to St. Gall.

Reichenau was located on an island in the Lake of Constance. Charlemagne, Louis the Pious, Charles the Fat, and many other German princes made large donations to the monastery of Reichenau. Consequently, its growth was rapid. It became important on account of its famous school of painters and of its famous medieval library. A catalogue drawn up by Reginbert, the librarian, about 831, enumerates over 500 works contained in 256 volumes. We have seen that this library was enriched by books sent from St. Gall for safe-keeping. These were never restored to their original owners.

We may pass by Corvey and Sponheim. Fulda, however, contained a very important library. The abbey of Fulda became important also in other directions. It exerted a lasting influence on architectural and artistic activity in distant places. The monastic school was established by Sturmius and flourished in the days of Alcuin and Charlemagne. The school contained departments in architecture, sculpture, and painting. The great scholar, Rhatbanus Maurus, brought the institution to such a height that it was regarded the chief institution of civilization and learning throughout Europe as well as Ger-

many. Its library under the same scholar ranked as the best equipped in Christendom. Religious and classical literature was found in its archives. The monks of the monastery, who were usually regarded as zealous men, produced valuable manuscripts. At the beginning of the sixteenth century the library possessed 900 volumes. Most of these, however, were destroyed in 1631, during the Thirty Years' War and the library has never again been discovered.

In France, the most famous libraries were those of Cluny, Fleury, Corbie and St. Riquier. Cluny easily ranked as the most important of France, as did also the abbey of the same place. The library was the storehouse of a great number of valuable manuscripts. In 1522 it was sacked and its contents either perished or were scattered. During the French Revolution it was partly burned, or at least, part of the books were burned, while others were stored away in the town hall of Cluny. These and others, which had become the property of private persons, have gradually been collected by the French government, which since has preserved them in the Bibliothèque Nationale at Paris. The British Museum also has about sixty charters, which once were the property of the library at Cluny.

Fleury, or more correctly, Fleury-Saint-Benoit, also had an old and famous library in connection with the abbey. From the abbey came Cardinal de Richelieu, who had been one of its abbots.

The abbey at Corbie, or Corbey, in Picardy, was founded in 657 by St. Bathilde. Its library was rich and extensive, but it was removed to St. Germain-des-Pres in 1624.

In 831, the library of St. Riquier contained 250 volumes, "and a note at the end of the catalogue informs us that if the different treaties had been entered separately, the number of entries would have exceeded 500, as many books were frequently bound in a single volume. The works in this library are roughly sorted under the head-

ings: Divinity, Grammar, History, and Geography, Sermons, Service-books."[6]

The library at Bobbio in Italy remains to be noticed. St. Columban who received from the Lombard king a district known as Ebovium, built a church there and beside it an abbey. He brought manuscripts from Ireland. It was destined to become the most celebrated library in Italy. Treatises, written by himself, were also placed in its archives. The abbey passed under the Rule of Benedict, as so many did on the Continent. Bobbio attained great importance on account of piety and culture which were fostered there. The valuable library of St. Dungal, consisting of some seventy volumes, was bequeathed to Bobbio. This was an important bequest, for among the volumes there was the famous Antiphonary of Bangor. In the tenth century a catalogue of the library was published by Muratori. It shows that during that period every branch of knowledge was represented in the library. As was the fate of so many monastic libraries, so this one has lost many of its books. In 1616 Cardinal Borromeo brought eighty volumes from Bobbio to the Ambrosian library at Milan. In this transfer the famous Bobbio Missal, written about 911, the Antiphonary of Bangor, and the palimpsests of Ulfilas' Gothic version of the Bible were included. Again in 1618 twenty-six volumes were taken from this library by Paul V to the Vatican library. Some were sent to the Royal Archives at Turin, while seventy-one were found in the University library of the same place until it was destroyed by fire in 1904.

THE USE AND CARE OF BOOKS IN THE LIBRARIES

The Rule of St. Benedict may be regarded as the chief instrument which influenced the preservation of books and which created many new libraries. The provisions for the use and care of books and libraries were laid down in the forty-eighth chapter of the Rule, "Of daily manual labour."

Some extracts from the chapter are of interest: "Idle-

6 Clark, *op. cit.*, p. 96.

ness is the enemy of the soul; hence brethren ought, at certain seasons, to occupy themselves with manual labour, and again, at certain hours, with holy reading."

Then follows a guide for the hours to be devoted to reading during the different seasons of the year:

Between Easter and the calends of October let them apply themselves to reading from the fourth hour till near the sixth hour.

From the calends of October to the beginning of Lent let them apply themselves to reading until the second hour. During Lent, let them apply themselves to reading from morning until the end of the third hour—and, in these days of Lent, let them receive a book apiece from the library, and read it straight through. These books are to be given out at the beginning of Lent. Above all, let one or two seniors be appointed to go round the monastery at the hours when the brethren are engaged in reading and see that there be no slothful brother giving himself to idleness or to foolish talk and not applying himself to his reading, so that he is thus not only useless to himself, but a distraction to others. If such a one be found (which God forbid) let him be corrected once and a second time.

The third time a brother is found guilty of such behavior, the Rule specifies that the offender is to be chastized in such a way as to strike terror into others.

The Order of the Cluniacs, which originated at the beginning of the tenth century, followed the Rule of St. Benedict respecting the study and use of books. The care of books in the monasteries identified with this order follows:

On the second day of Lent the only passage of the Rule to be read in Chapter is that concerning the observance of Lent.

Then shall be read aloud a note of the books which a year before had been given out to brethren for their reading. When a brother's name is called, he rises, and returns the book that had been given to him; and if it should happen that he has not read it through, he is to ask forgiveness for his want of diligence.

A carpet on which those books are to be laid out is to be put down in the Chapter-House; and the titles of those which are distributed to brethren afresh are to be noted, for which purpose a tablet is to be made of somewhat larger size than usual.

The English Benedictines received instructions in regard to the use and care of books from Archbishop Lanfranc:

On the Monday after the First Sunday in Lent—before the brethren go in to Chapter, the librarian ought to have all the books brought together into the Chapter-House and laid out on a carpet, except those which had been given out for reading during the past year; these the brethren ought to bring with them as they come into Chapter, each carrying his book in his hand. Of this they ought to have had notice given to them by the aforesaid librarian on the preceding day in Chapter....Next let the librarian read a document setting forth the names of the brethren who have had books during the past year; and let each brother, when he hears his own name pronounced, return the book which had been entrusted to him for reading; and let him who is conscious of not having read the book through, which he had received, fall down on his face, confess his fault, and pray for forgiveness.

Then let the aforesaid librarian hand to each brother another book for reading; and when the books have been distributed in order, let the aforesaid librarian in the same Chapter put on record the names of the books, and of those who receive them.

The books in both the Benedictine and Cluniac monasteries were put in charge of the precentor. It was his special duty to keep all books in repair and personally to supervise the daily use of the manuscripts. Each book was to be restored to its proper place when a monk had finished reading it. This duty is prescribed in the following rule:

It is part of the precentor's duty to entrust to the younger monks the care of the presses, and to keep them in repair; whenever the convent is sitting in cloister, he is to go round the cloister as soon as the bell has sounded, and replace the books, in case any brother through carelessness should have forgotten to do so.

He is to take charge of all the books in the monastry, and have them in his keeping, provided his carefulness and knowledge be such that they may be entrusted to him. No one is to take a book out unless it be entered on his roll; nor is any book to be lent to any one without a proper and sufficient voucher, and this too is to be set down on his roll.

The Carthusians, who had the peculiar arrangement of living separately in different cells, were actively employed in writing books. Each cell had its own writing table and writing material necessary for such work. Regarding books the Rule says:

Moreover he (the monk) receives two books off the press for

reading. He is admonished to take the utmost care and pains that they be not soiled by smoke or dust or dirt of any kind; for it is our wish that books, as being the perpetual food of our souls, should be most jealously guarded, and most carefully produced, that we, who cannot preach the word of God with our lips, may preach it with our hands.

The Cistercians also followed the Benedictine Rule with reference to books. They, however, had a special regard and anxiety for their care, for they entrusted them not to the precentor as the Benedictines and Cluniacs, but to a special officer, and they provided a special room to receive them. Their rule for the regulation of books reads:

With regard to the production and safe-keeping of charters and books the abbot is to consider to whom he shall entrust this duty. The officer so appointed may go as far as the doors of the writing-rooms when he wants to hand in or to take out a book, but he may not go inside. In the same way for books in common use, as for instance, antiphoners, hymnals, graduals, lectionaries (etc.), and those which are read in the Frater and Collation, he may go as far as the door of the novices, and of the sick, and of the writers, and then ask for what he wants by a sign, but he may not go further unless he have been commanded by the abbot. When Collation is over it is his duty to close the press, and during the period of labour, of sleep, and of meals, and while vespers are being sung, to keep it locked.

The Augustinian Order, too, laid great stress on the use of books. Their rules are full of directions with regard to the way they are to be handled. The fourteenth chapter of the Customs in use in one of their monasteries was headed: "Of the safe-keeping of the books, and of the office of librarian." Part of the rule follows:

The librarian, who is called also precentor is to take charge of the books of the church; all which he ought to keep and to know under their separate titles; and he should frequently examine them carefully to prevent any damage or injury from insects or decay. He ought, also, at the beginning of Lent, in each year, to show them to the convent in Chapter, when the souls of those who have given them to the church, or of the brethren who have writtten them, and laboured over them, ought to be absolved, and a service in convent be held over them. He ought also to hand to the brethren the books which they see occasion to use, and to enter on his roll the titles of the books, and the names of those who receive

them. These, when required, are bound to give surety for the volumes they receive; nor may they lend them to others, whether known or unknown, without having first obtained permission from the librarian. Nor ought the librarian himself to lend books unless he receive a pledge of equal value; and then he ought to enter on his roll the name of the borrower, the title of the book lent, and the pledge taken. The larger and more valuable books he ought not to lend to anyone, known or unknown, without permission of the Prelate....

Books which are to be kept at hand for daily use, whether for singing or reading, ought to be in some common place, to which all the brethren can have easy access for inspection, and selection of anything which seems to them suitable. The books, therefore, ought not to be carried away into chambers, or into corners outside the cloister or the church. The librarian ought frequently to dust the books carefully, to repair them, and to point them, lest brethren should find any error or hindrance in the daily service of the church, whether in singing or in reading. No other brother ought to erase or change anything in the books unless he have obtained the consent of the librarian....

The press in which the books are kept ought to be lined inside with wood, that the damp of the walls may not moisten or stain the books. This press should be divided vertically as well as horizontally by sundry shelves on which the books may be ranged so as to be separated from one another; for fear they may be packed so close as to injure each other or delay those who want them.

The Reformed Augustianians, called the Premonstratensian used the same rule and required their librarian to take note of books borrowed as well as books lent.

CURSES AND IMPRECATIONS

Gradually there came into practice the custom of lending books either to the public or to other monasteries for the purpose of making copies. We may thus call the monastic libraries the public libraries of the Middle Ages. Risk of loss was involved in this practice either by way of theft or carelessness in returning on the part of the borrower. To insure books against such risks, curses or imprecations were frequently added at the end. A few will suffice to give an adequate idea of the language used in these anathemas.

This book belongs to St. Alban. May whosoever steals it from him or destroys its title be anathema. Amen.

May whoever destroys this title, or by gift or sale or loan or exchange or theft or by any other device knowingly alienate this book from the aforesaid Christ Church, incur in this life the malediction of Jesus Christ and of the most glorious Virgin His Mother, and of Blessed Thomas, Martyr. Should however, it please Christ, who is patron of Christ Church, may his soul be saved in the Day of Judgment."

Should any one by craft or any device whatsoever abstract this book from this place may his soul suffer, in retribution for what he has done, and may his name be erased from the book of the living and not be recorded among the Blessed.

May whosoever steals or alienates this manuscript, or scratches out its title, be anathema. Amen.

The loss of books in some instances caused a disposition to forbid the lending of books. And yet the lending of books for the purpose of helping one another in study or copying of manuscripts was looked upon as an act of charity. The Council of Paris, held in 1212 A. D., went so far as to decree:

We forbid those who belong to the religious Order, to formulate any vow against lending their books to those who are in need of them; seeing that to lend is enumerated among the principal works of mercy.

After careful consideration, let some books be kept in the House for the use of brethren; others, according to the decision of the abbot, be lent to those who are in need of them, the rights of the House being safeguarded.

From the present date no book is to be retained under pain of incurring a curse (for its alienating), and we declare all such curses to be of no effect.[7]

Shortly after this decree we hear of an instance where many books were bequeathed to a certain monastery, that of St. Victor, Paris, belonging to the Augustinian Order, on condition, however, that they be lent to anyone asking for them.

PERSONAL USE OF BOOKS

From certain appeals, or customs at least, we learn what high value was placed on books, and how, therefore, they were to be handled.

7 Delisle, in *Bibl. de l'École des Chartes*, Ser. 3, Vol. 1, p. 223.

In the library of St. Victor, just mentioned, the following was found at the end of a manuscript:

> Keep him afar from mine and me
> Who fails to books in courtesy.

Another appeal that is interesting was found in the same library:

> Whosoever pursues his studies in this book, should be careful to handle the leaves gently and delicately, so as to avoid tearing them by reason of their thinness; and let him imitate the example of Jesus Christ, who, when he had quietly opened the book of Isaiah and read therein attentively, rolled it up with reverence, and gave it again to the minister.

Similar to this appeal, in so far that it makes reference to a biblical incident, is the following, which is attributed to Thomas à Kempis:

> Take thou a book into thine hands as Simeon the Just took the child Jesus into his arms to carry him and kiss him. And when thou hast finished reading, close the book and give thanks for every word out of the mouth of God; because in the Lord's field thou hast found a hidden treasure.

Even the mode of holding a manuscript was prescribed. It is curious indeed:

> When the religious are engaged in reading in cloister or in church, they shall if possible hold the books in their left hands, wrapped in the sleeves of their tunics, and resting on their knees; their right hands shall be uncovered with which to hold and turn the leaves of the aforesaid books.

Once in a while a brother was reminded that he had soiled hands and that he was to wash them before taking up a book:

> Wash! lest touch of dirty fingers
> On my spotless pages linger.

Books were to be treated with reverence as we learn from Bishop Richard of Bury in Philobiblon (Chap. 26):

> And surely next to the vestments and vessels, dedicated to our Lord's Body, holy books deserve to be rightly treated by the clergy, to which great injury is done so often as they are touched by unclean hands.

THE OLD TESTAMENT IN GREEK

C. THEODORE BENZE
PHILADELPHIA, PA.

This was to have been a review of a magnificent work in process of publication; but the work itself so greatly involves some larger questions that we decided to combine the two, particularly since the best that can be said on the subject itself is due to the work to be reviewed. So, while this is to be an article on the general subject, we feel that first of all we ought to mention the title of the work, a volume of which has been put at our disposal by the publishers, the Cambridge University Press. It is *The Old Testament in Greek,* edited by Alan England Brooke, D.D., Norman McLean, M.A., and Henry St. John Thackeray, M.A. To the student, these three names represent a scholarship of the most brilliant kind, expended on a most intricate subject. They are names that are known to scholars in this field the world over.

Of the work itself five volumes have so far appeared: Volume I, The Octateuch, Part I, Genesis, 1906; Part II, Exodus and Leviticus, 1909; Part III, Numbers and Deuteronomy; Part IV, Joshua, Judges and Ruth, 1917; Volume II, Part I, I and II Samuel, 1928. They are quarto volumes and as they sell at about $7.00 a volume, the reader can estimate for himself both the extent of the work, when once completed, and the price involved. The latter is a fair indication of what it means to the publishers to bring out this monumental series. But all this is material and external. The actual greatness of the enterprise can only be conceived in terms of painstaking scholarship exercised in many centuries and in many countries. Not only that, but the last volume in particular bears evidence of the unselfish catholicity of scholarship and its co-operation across the boundaries of many countries. What is meant by this, is, that at present there is a smiliar enterprise being conducted in France and Germany as well; and in the last volume we

have the announcement that the great leader in the German enterprise, Professor Rahlfs, of Göttingen, has graciously put at the disposal of the English editors some of his own valuable material, the result of long research and investigation on his part and on the part of other German scholars.

In the same manner also, speaking of recent discoveries, the editors state that their list of authorities has been enlarged by a few additions, the most important being the Washington Codex of Deuteronomy and Joshua, one of the four Biblical manuscripts in the possession of Mr. Freer. After consultation with Professor Henry A. Sanders, it was denoted by the symbol Θ. Professor Sanders sent them advance sheets of his collation of the manuscript, and since the publication of the facsimile by the University of Michigan, they were enabled to revise the collation of its text. We might at this point state further that the manuscript is of the fifth century and contains the whole of the text of the two books, with the exception of one or two lacunae. Its greatest importance lies in the evidence it affords of the early existence of a text closely akin to that represented by the valuable though late cursives gn. It is not our purpose to discuss in this article the nature and value of all manuscripts in question; but we mentioned this incidentally as affording an example of the entrance of America into this field, and of the same fine courtesy as shown by the German scholar. Those interested in knowing more about the various manuscripts that enter into the investigation will find all needed information in Dr. Rahlf's *Verzeichniss der griechischen Handschriften des A. T.* Berlin, 1914.

The question naturally arises as to what this is all about. As far back as 1905 the present editors were entrusted with the task of preparing the larger Cambridge edition of the Septuagint. To quote their own words: "The object of our work is to present as clearly and fully as is possible within reasonable limits of space the evidence available for the reconstruction of the text or texts of the LXX. At an early stage it was decided that it would be premature to attempt to provide a reconstructed

or "true" text in this edition, and that the text of the Vatican manuscript should be followed wherever extant, its lacunae being supplied from the Alexandrian or another uncial manuscript. The Text of Dr. Swete's manual edition has, therefore, been reprinted with but few alterations."

For an understanding of the method followed, we might here state the principles laid down at the outset:

1 The notes immediately below the text contain the itacisms and small errors of the principal manuscript as well as of the other uncial manuscripts quoted in the manual edition, but not of the remaining uncials, nor of any cursive manuscripts.

2 In the main body of notes we have endeavored to give the substantial variants found in (a) all the extant uncial manuscripts and the 30 cursive manuscripts selected by us as representative, (b) the chief versions made from the Septuagint, (c) the writings of Philo, Josephus and the most important of the early Christian writers.

3 Our third set of notes contains the hexaplaric matter found in the margins of those manuscripts which we quote continuously, and of the Syro-hexaplar version.

In the carrying out of these principles, they have thus added a certain amount of new matter, not only in regard to the material indicated in 1) and 2) but also new matter not contained in Field's Hexapla.

As will be seen, this work is not yet a new and critical edition of the Septuagint, but puts into the hands of scholars the material from which to construct such an edition. That part of the work opens a vast field of labor which promises to bear rich fruit. Some work has already been done along this line. In Germany the Septuaginta-Unternehmen, under the general editorship of Professor Rahlfs is already at work on such a critical edition. In 1922, like a bird from the ark, a try-out was issued in the "Probeausgabe" of the Book of Ruth. This was edited by Professor Rahlfs himself. In 1926 he issued Genesis as the first part of the undertaking. So far as we have been able to ascertain, no further numbers have made their appearance. The German undertaking is planned to appear in sixteen parts as follows: I. Genesis; II. Exodus, Leviticus; III. Numbers, Deuter-

onomy; IV. Joshua, Judges, Ruth; V. Kings I and II; VI. Kings III and IV; VII. Chronicles I and II; VIII. Esdras I, II, Esther, Judith, Tobit; IX. Maccabees, I-IV; X. Psalms; XI. Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Canticles, Job; XII. Wisdom, Sirach, Psalms of Solomon; XIII. Twelve Prophets; XIV. Isaiah; XV. Jeremiah, Baruch, Lamentations, Epistle of Jeremiah; XVI. Ezekiel, Susanna, Daniel, Bel and the Dragon. The volume containing Genesis has also fifty pages of introduction. It is printed in the most beautiful Greek type available.

We note in Rahlfs' Preface to Genesis some interesting details concerning his method of procedure. In Ruth he had mentioned two individual manuscripts (BA) and four groups (OLRC). In Genesis he found a greater number of witnesses, but first of all only two large groups (OC) but a great number of smaller groups (bcloqr). Since the grouping of manuscripts in the case of Genesis is altogether different from what it is in the case of Ruth, he had to add one group after another and after repeatedly working over his apparatus, he finally adopted the entire material of manuscripts collated by Brooke and McLean. Here we have an unsolicited and unexpected proof of the future value of the greater Cambridge work.

We are accustomed to speak familiarly about the Septuagint and believe that we have in it an important version; but as a matter of fact, we do not generally realize that we do not possess a real Septuagint at all. We even make attempts at theoretical criticism of the Massoretic text at the hand of what we call the Septuagint and do not bear in mind that what we have is not in itself of sufficient accuracy to enable us to base upon it a critical argument of real value. If we once had an accurate text of the Septuagint in our hands as we have in the case of the New Testament, we should possess an apparatus upon which we could base the most far-reaching arguments. It is to give us such a reliable text that the scholars of the world are laboring so sedulously to give us, first of all such an apparatus as the Cambridge undertaking is giving us and such conclusions as will appear in the completed Septuaginta-Unternehmen.

But even so, aside from such questions as those just referred to, the Septuagint is of the utmost importance to us as a version. The Church Fathers had the highest veneration for it and spoke of it in such extravagant terms that it seems it was to them a token of the special providence of God, the work of direct inspiration and in line with the writings of the prophets. It does not to us vindicate its importance along these lines; but we must not forget that it was the first notable attempt to put the sacred truths of the Bible into the language understood by the people of its day. In this respect it became the pioneer missionary. It gave to the early preachers of the Gospel the terminology in which they conveyed the divine truth and in every way prepared the way for the reception of the Gospel. It is in a sense the first great Jewish commentary on the Old Testament, since its renderings have taught the sense in which it was understood by the Jewish theologians who labored to produce it, just as the Massoretic text gives us the interpretation of a still larger and much later group or groups of Jewish theologians. But it is a striking fact not to be forgotten that of the Hebrew Bible we have only the one authentic text, if we may use that word; and in the case of the Greek Bible we have so many texts, manuscripts and versions, that we have not yet reached a stage where we can speak of real reliability.

If we had this before us what an aid we should possess for the study of the Old Testament, both from a critical and from an expository standpoint! Besides this, as Swete describes so fully, we have in the Septuagint an invaluable aid to our study of the New Testament. In a similar manner the influence of this translation upon the theological and devotional literature of the Christian church is incalculable. Some writers have pointed to this; but the student will yet have to find for himself the wealth of references, quotations and allusions to which this version has given rise. The importance for the study of Hebrew philology is inestimable. If we only recall that at the time the Septuagint originated the Hebrew Bible was unpointed and that it contained no

exact system of pronunciation we can understand how useful the Greek text with its transliterations and in the case of words with double-entendre, its translations, has become to us even in the inadequate form in which we possess it. We might say as much for the importance of this version in the history of Greek literature, but that is somewhat aside from our subject.

We are told that Professor Ferd. Hitzig used to open his lectures on Old Testament exegesis with the appeal to his students, "Gentlemen, have you a Septuagint? If not, sell whatever you have and buy a Septuagint." We agree that he did not overestimate the importance of the Septuagint; but when a student comes to us with the request to be allowed to take the Septuagint, because of a real or imaginary inability to learn Hebrew, we are convinced that without some knowledge of Hebrew the treasures of Septuagint lore are as safely hidden from him as the buried treasures of Captain Kidd. Of this we have had ample proof in our experience with students.

But, if this digression be pardoned, what then is this Septuagint? Our first information concerning it comes to us from a remarkable booklet entitled *The Letter of Aristeas*. The story of this letter is in itself interesting as illustrating the ancient maxim, "Habent sua fata libelli." It appeared first in a Latin translation by Matthias Palmerius printed in Pisa in 1471. The Greek text was first brought out by Simon Schard in 1561. His edition was followed by a number in the seventeenth century based on his work, but while a number of manuscripts of it were found since the first publication of his text, it does not appear, says Swete, that any collations of them were made.[1]

In 1870 Schmidt brought out a text based on a complete collation of two Paris manuscripts (B and A) and a par-

1 In 1705 we still find Hody, who republished the text, saying contemptuously, "Non me fugit servari in Bibliotheca Regia Parisina, aliisque quibusdam exemplaria istius MS. Sed de tali opusculo, quod tanquam foetum suppositititium penitus rejïcio, Amicos solicitare, et in Partes longinquas mittere, vix operae pretium existimavi. Eas curas relinquo illis, quibus tanti esse res videbitur."

tial collation of a third. This was a good beginning, but nothing more. Since then the paraphrase made by Josephus and the extracts in Eusebius, the discovery of a large number of manuscripts and the fresh light thrown on the language by the papyri of the Ptolemaic period, have at last set this letter into a new position of importance.

In 1870 Professor Lumbroso published his *Recherches sur l'Economie Politique de l'Egypte sous les Lagides*, in which we meet with a different estimate of this famous piece of literature. He says:

> Beginning about forty years ago, an unexpected ray of light has burst forth from inscriptions and from papyri, which sheds a new light upon it. A striking thing: there is not a court title, an institution, a law, a magistrature, a charge, a technical term, a formula, a peculiar turn of speech in this letter, there is not a testimony of Aristeas concerning the civil history of the epoch, which is not registered in the papyri, or in the inscriptions and confirmed by them.

It is now an accepted fact that it was written under some one of the later Ptolemies. A good resultant text of the letter in Greek may be found in Swete and a modern translation in Kautzsch's *Apokryphen und Pseudepigraphen des Alten Testaments*.

We are here not further concerned with the critical questions that are connected with Aristeas and his letter. We accept the conclusion that the letter, which was written by an Egyptian Jew to Philocrates, concerning the Greek translation of the Torah is not a historical record, but a legend. The arguments against the plausibility of the writer need not be repeated. But a renewed study of the letter itself by Johannes Herrmann, a disciple of Kittel's, led to very definite results that must be considered. He says that while Aristeas may report a legend, that does not dispose of the historical nucleus of this legend. The composition of the book, according to him, makes it evident that the author did not invent, but simply made use of the legend. It is older than his book.

A literary analysis made by this scholar, from which we draw the following facts, shows that the legend is

comparatively short and simple. When all side issues are eliminated, it may be stated in very few words. The author represents his Aristeas as taking part in an embassy of Ptolemy Philadelphus to the High Priest. The desire of his friend Philocrates to hear something more definite from Aristeas becomes the literary occasion for the writing of the letter. That is the simple frame in which the legend is set. May we quote from Herrmann:

> The chief of the royal library in Alexandria, Demetrius of Phaleron, suggests to the king to place a copy of the Jewish laws in the royal library. He is then to have a translation made. The king gives orders to this effect to the Jewish High Priest Eleazar in Jerusalem (9-11). This is done (33). The letter to Eleazar is reported (35-40). In it the king requests the High Priest to select six men each from every tribe, who know the Law and are able to translate it. The idea is that by the agreement of the majority the sense may be determined. Eleazar's answer (41-50) reports that the latter has received the embassy of Ptolemy, bearing the letter and that he has selected the seventy-two men and sent them on with the Law. Eleazar selects the men (121). He dismisses the embassy with rich gifts and safe escort and with them the Seventy-two. The latter on reaching Alexandria are received with much honor by the king (172). Demetrius gathers the Seventy-two in a house on Pharos, built near the shore. Here they complete the translation by reaching an agreement after comparing their efforts and Demetrius writes it down (301-2). It is found that the work has been completed in seventy-two days, as if that had been the intention (307). Demetrius assembles the Jewish congregation of Alexandria at the place where the translation was made and reads the same to them (308). It is universally approved and the congregation asks for a copy for its heads (309). The priests and the elders together give the promise that this translation shall be preserved verbatim and unaltered (310). Demetrius in accordance with Jewish customs commands that those who act contrary to the agreement be cursed (311). The work is then read to the king and he admires the spirit of the law-giver (312). The translators are graciously dismissed (317).

This, according to Herrmann, is the synopsis of the legend. He is convinced that the legend begins with §9. His arguments for the whole synopsis appear convincing. We have not the space to reproduce them here. It has long been recognized that the author is a Jew who is chiefly concerned with the glorification of the Jewish Law, Judaism and the Jews. It is evident, says Herr-

mann, that the points which were of the greatest importance to him were fortunately those that were of the greatest import in the legend itself, viz. what authority is due the Septuagint Torah on the basis of the technique of its production and what respect it deserves, especially on the basis of the relations of King Ptolemy to its production.

Granting that the author is quite distant from the time of Ptolemy Philadelphus, it is yet quite conceivable that Philadelphus may have instigated the preparation of the translation regardless of the rôle which Demetrius played in the affair. It must be affirmed that there are no decisive reasons against the possibility of Ptolemy desiring a translation of Jewish sacred writings for his library, nor that it is historically improbable. It is equally probable that this desire met a similar desire on the part of the Alexandrian Jewry. Accepting the arguments against the production of the translation by seventy-two Palestinian scholars, it is after all evident that the legend attaches importance to the fact that the translation achieved its diction not from an individual, but from the common labors of a commission composed of many members and receives its authority from them. After all that we know about the work of Alexandrian scholars there is not the slightest reason to deny that the translation of the Jewish Law was made by a commission of specialists as their common work.

Further, the traits in §§308-311 point to the fact that the translation must have been an official undertaking of the Jews of Alexandria. We need only to refer to the solemn act of delivering the translation and the protection sought by the imprecations. All this would not have been necessary if we were concerned only with a translation for Ptolemy's library. The technique of the translation is described in very meager words in §302. The exact number of seventy-two days may be viewed as a toying with numbers, just as well as the rather large number of seventy-two translators. It merely expresses the idea that the translation was a com-

mon undertaking of many scholars and completed in a relatively short time.

The manner in which the Prophetae Posteriores were translated sheds a further light on the relation between the production of the Torah and the rest of the Pentateuch. It seems on closer study that the legend of the Aristeas letter points to the production of the Torah translation. We can feel sure that when the Septuagint was translated there was already in existence a translation of Genesis. It is possible, Herrman does not wish to say more, that back of the legend there is something more than the mere words of the legend express. This something more seems to find expression in the limitation of the translation to the Torah. He bases this on the circumstance that if the Septuagint reaches back to a time when the Torah alone possessed a sort of canonicity, only a translation of it was made at first. But we do not know much about this. At a time when the collection of the Prophets was closed, not only the Torah, but also the Prophetae Priores must have existed in closed form. That, according to him is entirely possible for the time of Philadelphus.

If the legend asserts from a rather correct remembrance that at that time an official translation of the Torah appeared, it is quite conceivable that more than that was in the air. It might have been a question of Torah and Prophets Posterior and Anterior. The leaders of the Jews in Alexandria must have been concerned as much about the prophets as about the Torah. But these are guesses.

We may now proceed to a review of the question of the translation of the Prophets. In 1923 Herrmann and Baumgärtel together published a joint work on the history of the origin of the Septuagint, which they dedicated to two prominent scholars, Kittel and Rothstein, who were then celebrating their seventieth birthday. The first thing that stands out in this little book is the discovery that Herrmann made in regard to the translation of Ezekiel. He was studying the use of the divine names in this prophetic book and incidentally came to the con-

clusion that the Greek translation must have been made by two, respectively three translators. They must have produced their work consecutively, not jointly, and so he divides as follows: Chapter 1—about 27 for the first, 28-39 for the second, and 40-48 for the third.

The question under investigation concerned the originality of the name אדני יחוה in Ezekiel which arises urgently if one compares the data in the Massoretic text and the Septuagint. It had long been observed that the אדני יחוח of the Massoretic text and particularly of the Septuagint Vaticanus, against which the codices Alexandrinus and Marchalianus appear corrected on the basis of the Massoretic text, was reproduced in many instances by a mere κύριος, sometimes by κύριος κύριος or κύριος ὁ θεός. This fact was made to furnish an example of the reliability of the Massoretic text in relation to the Septuagint. Not only that; but it became customary to answer the question in favor of the Septuagint and against the Massoretic text. Herrmann's investigation turned entirely in favor of the reliability of the Massoretic text in this particular. He did not ascribe any great importance to this fact but the important thing that now appeared was that in examining the Massoretic text and the Septuagint manuscripts Vaticanus, Alexandrinus and Marchalianus it became evident that Vaticanus as far as chapter 20 has hardly ever a κύριος κύριος, up to 29 only occasionally, to 39 predominatingly and in 40-48 (more exactly 43-48) has in place of κύριος and κύριος κύριος only κύριος ὁ θεός (43-44) and κύριος θεός (45-48). The result of the whole study was that he came to the conclusion that three translators had been at work here.

This conclusion was confirmed when he learned subsequently that as early as 1909 Josef Schäfers and still earlier H. St. J. Thackeray in 1903, had reached similar conclusions, except that Thackeray's conclusion was that 1-27 and 40-48 were translated by one author and 28-39 by another. The remarkable thing about the discovery was that all three reached the same division of the book independently. The investigation did not, however, content itself with the study of the Divine names but turned

to a variety of other criterions such as the translation of definite Hebrew phrases and inner-Greek phenomena. The argument as presented by Herrmann seems to be conclusive that we have for Ezekiel three translators. The first translated approximately the first half of the book, the second began at 28 and continued apparently with the first copy before him. For some reason not apparent he did not finish his work, and a third translator finished the grand finale of the book.

In a similar manner Baumgärtel came to the conclusion that Isaiah had two translators. The first to express this opinion was Gray, of whose investigations Baumgärtel was aware. Both concluded that the first translator proceeded as far as 39 and the second from 40 to the end. There was, however, this difference: with Gray the conclusion was still problematic, with Baumgärtel we come to well substantiated arguments.

To this we may add Thackeray's conclusion in regard to Jeremiah, that there we find one translator up to 28, a second beginning at 29 and that 52 may have a third translator. It is of interest to note that the two young German scholars came to a similar conclusion in regard to the Twelve Prophet Book. It became evident to them that the book was divided between two translators and that the first half, including Jonah was given to one of them and that the other worked out the rest.

As to the origin of a prophet Septuagint everything now points to the conclusion that the division of the work was according to a definite plan. This involved the bisection of the individual books, each half being given to a separate translator. This leads to the conclusion that the prophetic books were translated by a group of translators at a definite time and jointly, working under a definite commission. It may be that this circle formed of its own accord privately, and it may be that it received such a commission from some directing personage or community. Thackeray himself in pointing out the duality of copyists in the case of Exodus and Leviticus says expressly: "They seem to indicate beyond a doubt, the existence at a very early time, if not actually as early as

the autographs themselves, of a practice of dividing each book for clerical purposes into two nearly equal portions." He continues by saying, "Probably each book was written on two rolls." This was no doubt true in regard to Exodus and Leviticus and may find consideration here; but it is perhaps not borne out in the case of every book.

Now the question arises whether the theory of a joint, contemporaneous translation of the later prophets in the manner pointed out above harmonizes with the general conception of the origin of the Septuagint. It is accepted that the collection of the prophetic writings, inasmuch as the Book of Daniel was not included in it, must have been completed some time before it. This would give us for the terminus ad quem the first quarter of the second century. But after Meinhold had already tried to prove that Dan. 2-6 falls before the Maccabean period, G. Hölscher has proved conclusively that Dan. 1-7 is pre-Maccabean and belongs to approximately the third century. Since there would have been no reason for not placing at least this part of Daniel into the Book of the Prophets, like that of Jonah, if the collection of the Prophets had not already been closed, the lower limit for the collection falls further into the third century. There is besides no serious reason why it should not be moved further back. Thus Herrmann.

So far the fact seems established that the Greek translation was actually the work of many men and that they worked according to a definite mode of procedure. That being the case we may well believe in the kernel of the legend in the Aristeas letter. But there are still further questions to be considered before we approach the actual history of the translations of the Hebrew Bible into Greek.

BOOK REVIEWS AND NOTICES

OLD AND NEW TESTAMENT

Great Men and Movements in Israel. By Rudolf Kittel, Professor at the University of Leipzig. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1929. XIV + 465 pages. $5.00.

This is a book of great interest to Old Testament students, intended not merely for scholars and specialists, but also for the "educated general public," with illuminating and discriminating judgments, well-written and very readable, translated into the best of English by two American college women, one of whom has served as Dr. Kittel's secretary in Leipzig since 1922.

Professor Kittel needs no introduction to the readers of the Quarterly, who recognize his leadership in Old Testament studies. He is probably best known to biblical students for his text of *Biblia Hebraica;* for his *History of the People of Israel,* and for *The Religion of the People of Israel.* There is something fascinating in the thought that this great theological teacher had a youthful ambition to become a country pastor, in "a friendly idyllic pastorate, such as often existed in earlier days." (Would that such ideals of pastoral service might persist in our day!) He is an authority on the Old Testament and on the people of Israel. Some radicals will regard him as moderately conservative; and some conservatives, as modernistic. But all will concede that he has a wide acquaintance with Israel and with the nations of antiquity. He writes in a pleasing style. It is free, direct, earnest, appreciative. He is indeed moderately conservative, and yet with independent judgment. Close association with his Old Testament heroes has seemingly met with a reflection in his own character. This was exhibited in the revolutionary days of Germany in 1919, when as rector of the University of Leipzig he calmly looked into the guns which the revolutionists pointed at him, and bade them do what they would. His calm demeanor and spirit of courage brought speedy relief. They were suspicious of University reactionary propaganda. He compares Jehu of Israel to these revolutionists and wonders what would have happened to Jehu if he had faced virile opponents.

The author's purpose is twofold. His primary purpose is to make a new historic venture,—"to try to learn to understand the soul of individuals and great peoples, and thus the history of humanity." Contrary to Wellhausen he bases his conclusion not only upon the Old Testament books, but also upon the results of the discovery and decipherment of Egyptian and Babylonian inscriptions. His visit to Palestine in later years helped him to look upon the Old Testament not so much as a book, but as the reflec-

tion of a life. This recourse to the evidence of pick and spade is familiar in our day. It has accomplished much to make the records of the Old Testament appear more reasonable to those of doubting mind. On the other hand some will question the value of the testimony of historic statements, when connected with so much of crude mythology and extravagant statement of boasting of the nation's greatness and prowess, with nothing scarcely of its reverses and defeats. For purposes of corroboration it will certainly be used with signal effect; but for new material or diverse material under such a barrage of human perversion its value cannot be very great to him who would look for certainty in historic records. The author seems to share the feeling of Carlyle that heroes are the "decisive factors in history," somewhat in harmony with the description given Dr. Elert's paper recently in Copenhagen, "His paper took the form of indicating how the personal experiences of one man or of a small group of men can become the type and the standard for many." He believes that democracy is not so much the rule of the masses but of the outstanding personalities; and that history is a "purely aristocratic phenomenon."

His secondary purpose he avers in the epilogue,—to dispel an illusion that seems to affect the judgment of many philosophers, politicians and statesmen, namely that there has been any great advance of man either morally or spiritually in the progress of centuries. Many will take issue with him herein, and will feel that it is a judgment that has grown out of too close a view of the devastations of the Great War.

There is simplicity in the plan of the book. In eighteen chapters the author traverses the historic record of Israel during the Old Testament period, fixing the attention upon the outstanding personalities: Moses; Deborah; Jerubbaal-Gideon; Samuel and Saul; David; Elijah and the Religious Enthusiasts; Great Narrators; Revolutionists; Classic Prophets; Amos and Hosea; Isaiah; Reformers; Lawgivers; Jeremiah; Second Isaiah and the Great Sufferer; Ezra and Nehemiah; Judas the Maccabee. According to the viewpoint of the author little or nothing is made of such characters as Samson, Jonah, Daniel or Esther. In the movement so largely directed by the prophets and reformers, the kings are given a subordinate place—only as affected by or affecting that movement.

Two things the book brings into prominence: first the great personalities through whom God effects his purposes; and secondly the natural sequence of events in Israel's career from the Exodus to the deliverance from the Syrian power through the Maccabees. Moses is one of the greatest men of history ("though half merged in legend"), with the "volcanic nature" of Luther and the "iron will" of Bismarck. His meekness seems to find no place in the estimate of his strength. We can scarcely accept the view pre-

sented by the author of the Mosaic Yahweh as "an uncanny, all-powerful, jealous, wrathful, and revengeful lord and master," "a demonical God as well as the God of the ethical laws and of the ethical will," somewhat akin to Spengler's description of Marcion's conception of the God of the Old Testament: "Jehovah as the Creator-God, the Demiurge, is the 'Just' *and therefore the evil*: Jesus as the incarnation of the Saviour-God in this evil creation is the 'alien'—that is, the good Principle." He therefore said of the Old Testament, "it was a devil's book that the Christian had in his hands." Dr. Kittel thus expresses his estimate of Moses: "Whenever we speak of the greatest men who were instrumental in elevating and purifying religious life and thought, men like Zarathustra, St. Paul, St. Augustine, Luther and Calvin, we shall always speak of Moses."

He shows a fine discrimination of caracter in the delineation of Saul the "creator of the state of Israel," with his temperamental nature, choleric, melancholic, phlegmatic, and lacking in sanguine hopefulness. There is a charming description of David at Saul's Round Table in the company of his warriors, with the women in an adjoining apartment gazing admiringly upon the assembled heroes. "The hearts of the women, and more than all others, that of the charming princess, beat faster. His blond hair, his beautiful eyes, his comely person, and the fame of his deeds had long enthralled her. And now when he sang the fame of her father's and of her brother's deeds, she could no longer withstand the knightly singer; she gave her seat to him." It is a picture of old Israel "when knighthood was in power." Solomon is described as a "real Sultan," but his fame is embellished by "the nursery tales that elevated Solomon to be a fairy prince." The record of Elijah is in the main historical. "After Moses, Elijah was the greatest man in Israel's religious life." But such a fiery nature falls into the hands of "legend," and so "things that by their nature were impossible were included in the narrative." The impetuous spirit drove him with his message into the city and thence into the desert, and hence the legend "that the spirit of Yahweh carried him as he willed, now here, now there."

The Narrators, from wandering minstrels become the historians and scribes. The author sees their origin in the steppes of southern Judah in the region of Kirjath-Sepher (Book-City) whence he associates together the Rechabites, Kenites, Judeans, Levites and the clans of scribes. One of the greatest Narrators was *possibly* Abiathar, David's trusted priest, whom together with Thucydides and Xenophon, Dr. Kittel regards as among the best historians of antiquity. His great character sketches are those of David, Absalom and Joab. He is followed by the great Yahwist—one of the greatest in Israel and one of the greatest characters of all times, "who is responsible for so many of the legends of the past, a great thinker, seeking an explanation of

things and especially of man.—the origin of evil and of language, etc. His record is found within the first six books where it can be separated "without great difficulty." In Yahwist's account of the flood, Dr. Kittel says that instead of a polytheistic mythology he has given a monotheistic mythology. Among the Revolutionists he cites Jereboam and the heads of the various dynasties of Israel. Jehu is described as "a most disgusting personality, a soldier of extreme daring and of ruthless selfishness." Elijah and Elisha were the real revolutionists.

Two classic prophets are singled out, exhibiting the two sides of Yahweh's character: Amos, his ethical nature, and Hosea, his love and mercy. Isaiah was a "diligent disciple of his great predecessors, Elijah and Amos." His faith was dominant. He is a link in the "unbroken chain of the greatest witnesses for the message of faith," Isaiah, Jesus, Paul and Luther. It is refreshing to hear the author challenge the serious scientist to account for the enigmas of experience of a man filled with the Spirit of God who was thus seemingly "beyond the natural laws of cause and effect, and under the special protection of his God."

He interprets the "sign" given to King Ahaz in Isaiah 7:14 not as a mere symbol but as a "real miracle, the virgin, a wonder woman; the child, a holy wonder child, a child of God, who should bring about a new era and become the future Savior." But Isaiah expected the realization in that day through the house of David:—"perhaps it was Hezekiah, who later became the king," and whom he greets in Isaiah 9:6.

The reformers such as Elijah and Jehu in Israel, and Asa, Hezekiah and Josiah in Judah represented the spiritual reaction against any heathen custom or cult that interfered with the exclusive Yahweh worship. There were really two great reforms, one directed against the Phoenician Baal and Ashtoreth and the other aginst the Assyrian gods Asshur and Ishtar. The student's difficulty, in keeping the kings of Israel and Judah, when they carry the same name, may be appreciated when we read on page 293—"Ahab was succeeded by his son, Ahaziah, who died early at Jehu's hands. He was followed by his ambitious mother, Athaliah." Ahaziah *of Judah* fell at Jehu's hands, and was followed by Athaliah.

Judah had many unknown lawgivers who were followers of Moses. The objection to Mosaic laws has long been dispelled by the discovery of a well-established system of laws in Sumeria, Babylonia, the Hittite State and in ancient Assyria. The author discusses fully the question of legislation under Moses, and sees no reason for questioning the fact of the origin of the substance of the levitical law in the Mosaic Book of the Covenant of Ex. 20-23, the Deuteronomic Code and the Priestly Code of Exodus, Leviticus and Numbers, though put into final shape by later lawgivers. He believes the modern experience with ritual

would rather favor the combination of ethical teaching with the regulation of ritual worship. The contrary view is unhistorical. Speaking of modern conditions he says, "The ritual completes the sermon and is often a welcome substitute for it. All preachers are not brilliant speakers, and to make devotion depend entirely upon preaching is dangerous." Jeremiah is recognized as "the greatest of the great prophets of Israel." "Jeremiah became the father of religious cosmopolitanism, of the conception that religion is supernatural. A citizen has a fatherland; religion has none. The world belongs to religion. Even though Jeremiah may have been without great worldly success, "the world has seen few greater than he."

The Second Isaiah (Isaiah 40-45, about 540 B. C.) is believed to have lived in exile and to have succeeded his two great predecessors, Jeremiah in Jerusalem and Ezekiel in Babylon, and to have been under the unconscious influence of the mental atmosphere created by Solon, Thales, Pythagoras, Xenophon, and in the east of Zarathustra with his new way of thinking about God. The author says that "he nowhere mentions the Messiah, and yet is writing soon after Jehoiachin's release, due to "intentional silence," and perhaps "for fear of violent interference by the Babylonian authorities." The Great Sufferer—the "Servant of Yahweh"—is another anonymous one in Isaiah. Who was he? Dr. Kittel says that to the New Testament and to Christians of all ages he represents the long looked for Savior. To others, he represents the entire nation of Israel. His conclusion, without any attempt to give detailed proof, is that the Second Isaiah and the Great Sufferer "were contemporaries and had a close personal relationship." He gives a fascinating imaginative description of the Second Isaiah meeting this unknown man, unattractive in outward appearance and yet mysteriously drawn to him as the one through whom Israel's deliverance would come. Events followed in quick succession as recounted in Isaiah 53. Suit was brought against him. He was condemned—"an unparalleled tragedy, the life and death of the great Martyr." Thereupon Second Isaiah came to the conviction that the Great Sufferer was the Messiah, and that his return to earth was possible as the Servant of Yahweh. Second Isaiah "discovered the idea of vicarious atonement and of the suffering and resurrection of the Savior." Ezra and Nehemiah were the fathers of Judaism. "Neither was a really great man; neither was a real geinus, nor had unusual greatness of soul or great religious zeal. And again, "Neither Ezra nor Nehemiah had been truly religious." The author claims that the Persian Empire effected the separation of the church and state in Israel, in which Christianity, Islam and many religious cults had their origin. He brings his history to a close with the Maccabees—"under whom began one of the bitterest and most disastrous wars

history has known." "With Judas Maccabeus passed the last of the great men of Israel."

From the foregoing we believe we can arrive at certain concluding criticisms:

1. That the conjectural mode of interpretation is not conducive to certainty in historical criticism. Undoubtedly the Old Testament is a religious book rather than a book of history. But there is evidently history in it. Over against the simple statements therein concerning the origin of the people of Israel, Dr. Kittel says—"Israel's origin and ancestors we do not know and in all probability shall never know with certainty." Conjectural probabilities will never increase the certainty of the germinal records of the Scriptures. We can not see that the record of David and his brotherly relation with Jonathan gains anything in force or certainty from the following conjectures: "We do not know positively what the intentions of David and Jonathan were beyond deposing Saul." Then again, "It seems clear to me that during David's sojourn in Judah, his thoughts turned toward a deliberate struggle for the throne of Judah." If the conjectural attitude should be maintained throughout the treatment of the Old Testament it would mean the elmimination of much historical material as mere legend, as well as all that is miraculous or supernatural. In one paragraph of 28 lines, seven times we read such words as "probably," "doubtless," "seem" and "perhaps," and seven times in another paragraph of 22 lines. And so frequently. We gladly acknowledge that this attitude is to be preferred to that of dogmatism, which too often characterizes the utterances of those who in the spirit of freedom of thought treat the Scriptures simply as the literary product of an ancient people. But we question the service rendered to the cause of truth by either attitude, unwarranted dogmatism or loose conjecture. In popular phrase of defective English, "It gets you nowhere."

2. That subjectivity of interpretation is lacking in the power to awaken assurance in the minds of others eager for historic certainty, though it may be very suggestive and provocative of thought. According to this attitude there can be no certainty in Scripture. The Bible becomes a mere compilation of legends with a small admixture of history for him who is skillful enough to detect it. This is notably the case with Genesis, with its records of the origin of all things and of the people of Israel, as they came from the hands of the Yahwist narrator. It is interesting here to observe that Josephus began his *Antiquities of the Jews* with the record of Creation; Margolis and Marx in their recent *History of the Jewish People*, with the call of Abraham; and Dr. Kittel, with Moses. The region beyond is regarded for the most part as legendary and can furnish no great central characters for the making of history. We are well aware of the fact that may modern critics would push the historic period to a much later date.

When Gideon, who might naturally be subject to the religious confusion of his day, yet in the spirit of loyalty to Yahweh refused the overture of the men of Israel to become their ruler, "I will not rule over you, etc.," Dr. Kittel replies, "If he said this (it is not probable) he quickly changed his mind." The same tendency to subjective treatment with swift generalization we note in many places, as when Saul is chosen king; in the relation of Samuel and Saul; the story of Elijah and Ahab; David and Goliath; Moses at Kadesh-Barnea; the accounts of David's magnanimity toward Saul; Solomon's temple, etc. Excessive subjectivity is not conducive to certainty of objective truth.

3. That naturalism, as dominating physical and psychological science, is scarcely an adequate method of approach to the problems of religion and of God,—who while the God of nature and to that degree a natural God, in his very nature, as such, cannot be bound to the limitations of man's science,—otherwise God is no longer God, but a creature or being under the limitations of nature. First Samuel tells us that Israel's defeat with the loss of the ark at Ebenezer was due to Israel's disloyalty to Yahweh and his law: but we are told, "They had been overconfident." There is a natural interpretation of the Scriptures. Anything of a supernatural character is either passed over in silence or is treated as part of a legend. The people had religion. They had faith in Yahweh. They had heroic leaders of genius. And they triumphed, naturally, or were naturally defeated. The revelation of the Old Testament becomes then simply the evidence of the triumph of men of true qualities of strong leadership, scarcely different from the fate of Egypt or Assyria or even of modern Europe.

4. That the only proper approach to the Old Testament as a book of revealed religion is by the way of the New Testament. The Bible is not a mere literary product. If we would recognize in the Old Testament the fact of a divine revelation we might be justified in applying to it the strictest rules of literary criticism: but without such recognition, such a procedure of criticism is positively useless. It is not scientifically sound. Realizing the progressive nature of divine revelation, a direct approach to the Old Testament is unsatisfactory. We positively believe that man needs a mediator in religion in order to secure his right relationship with God, and that God has provided the Mediator, Christ Jesus. It may be humbling to our human pride, but we believe we need a mediator in the approach to the Old Testament—and in fact the same Mediator, the Christ. The New Testament is the revelation of Jesus Christ and therefore marks the way of approach to the Old Testament. Dr. Kittel uses with telling effect the discoveries that have been made through the decipherment of Egyptian and Babylonian inscriptions. Often there is an illumination of an otherwise dark page of history, and some light is

thrown on persons, places and events. But we can scarcely accept this material as the criterion by which to judge or through which to correct or rearrange the narratives of the Old Testament. Why must it be supposed to be more reliable and authoritative? But we are justified in going to the New Testament and to the unveiling of truth through the Christ and his apostles. In Dr. Kittel's work there is almost an entire absence of reference to the New Testament. When, for example, the Second Isaiah gives the proclamation of preparation for the return of Yahweh in leading his people back from captivity, why shall we not accept Matthew's testimony, "For this is he (John the Baptist) that was spoken of through Isaiah the prophet?" We believe it is possible to use the New Testament in the interpretation of the Old Testament without in any way distorting the record, or as Eduard Koenig of Bonn puts it, without "ethnicalizing, Judaizing or even Christianizing" the text. But we believe that the text can be interpreted only in the light of the fulness of the truth as revealed in Christ.

There is a charm in the author's fascinating interpretation of the historic situations centering round the great characters of the Old Testament, in which he exhibits a keen insight into the motives of men. But the Bible is not a mere literary product of the past. The acceptance of divine revelation is essential. Otherwise there is no guarantee of truth beyond the physical or psychological realm. Speaking of Luther's independence of judgment in dealing with the biblical text, Dr. J. A. W. Haas in his *Biblical Criticism* says: "It is well known that he said of Esther: 'It judaizes,' that he placed little value on James and the Apocalypse, that he saw an error in Stephen's sermon, in John's report of Peter's denial, that he wrote in the introduction to Link's annotations that the later prophets read in the books of the earlier, and that sometimes straw, hay and stubble have fallen in." But with all Luther's freedom of utterance, Dr. Haas emphasizes his acceptance of divine revelation,—"It was this assurance of revelation, with Christ as center, which kept Luther safe".

T. W. KRETSCHMANN

Nabonidus and Belshazzar: A Study of the Closing Events of the Neo-Babylonian Empire. By Raymond Philip Dougherty. New Haven: Yale University Press. xii + 216 pages. $3.00.

This book is Volume XV of The Yale Oriental Series, to the promotion of which the late Prof. Clay devoted his best energies and to which he contributed several notable volumes. Prof. Dougherty's book is a worthy successor. He set himself the task of publishing the translation of the Nabonidus texts in the Yale Babylonian Collection. This led him to an investigation of all available Neo-Babylonian source material bearing on the subject.

This result is here tabulated and it proves a confirmation of the fifth chapter of Daniel. Four classes of documents are reviewed: cuneiform sources, Greek sources, Jewish sources and ecclesiastical sources.

The sources of highest value are the cuneiform. From them the following facts are deduced: that Nabonidus, the last of the listed Kings of Neo-Babylonia, was of princely and devout parentage, his mother being a high priestess of the moon god; that he married a daughter of Nebuchadnezzar, by whom he became the father of Belshazzar; that Belshazzar was associated with him in the administration of the affairs of Babylon and in his absence was virtual king; that Nabonidus was in Arabia at the strategic city of Têma' from the third to the eleventh years of his reign, and were the Nabonidus Chronicle not mutilated we should doubtless read of other absences; that Nabonidus was absent from Babylon when Cyrus captured it and that on his return me was made a prisoner. In view of these facts "*the fifth chapter of Daniel ranks next to cuneiform literature in accuracy* so far as outstanding events are concerned." "The Scriptural account may be interpreted as excelling because it uses the name Belshazzar (Baruch and Josephus use Baltasar), and because it recognizes that a dual rulership existed in the Kingdom." Three statements in Daniel V say that he "shall rule as third in the Kingdom." The famous Greek historians Herodotus and Xenophon do not mention Belshazzar by name and only vaguely hint at the actual political situation in the time of Nabonidus, and later Greek annals are absolutely silent about it. "The total information found in all available chronologically fixed documents later than the cuneiform texts and prior to Josephus could not have provided the necessary material for the historical framework of the fifth chapter of Daniel."

It is but fair to add a word of commendation of Prof. Dougherty's orderly and cumulative method in the use of his evidence and his entertaining and lucid style.

H. C. Alleman

Preaching Values in New Translations of the New Testament. By Halford Luccock. New York: The Abingdon Press, 1928. 312 pages. $2.00.

This volume presents in popular spoken language and style, ideas, suggestions and facts on over 135 striking texts of the New Testament as they appear in the Moffatt, Weymouth and Goodspeed translations. They are stimulating and suggestive. They are valuable not only to the student who uses these translations in his study, but to the Bible student who uses the older texts. It is an attempt to make the language of the New Testament picturesque and its truth to live among us today. The very modest price does not suggest the value of these "Values." It is very unfortu-

nate that the book has no index of the scripture passages and texts on which comments are presented.

H. D. HOOVER

SYSTEMATIC THEOLOGY

Affirmative Religion. By Winfred E. Garrison. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1928. x + 292 pages. $2.00.

This volume presents a plea for positive truth, for liberalism and tolerance. It is of the new school of apologetics. It attempts to throw light into many unexamined corners of our routine thinking. Of course one may ask, Does all this skirmishing defend the *faith*, or preserve *the* faith, or create faith? The defects of the work are not subtle, and the author's enthusiasm is contagious. There are many quotable passages. I have marked at least a score.

It is a seed basket for thinkers. The method of the book is to hold truth as seed, and not as authority, law, a passport or a jewel case. It is a book to be read slowly and punctuated with pungent thinking. Then it should be reread after further experience and meditation. This is true not because of what is said, merely, but because of the viewpoint, reflections, inferences, and because it furnishes starting points for lines of thought reaching farther and burrowing deper.

H. D. HOOVER

Newman on the Psychology of Faith. By Sylvester P. Juergens. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1928. xvii + 288 pages; index. $2.75.

This scholarly and highly illuminating study of the great English convert to Romanism is presented in five chapters as follows: Newman's Purpose and Method; Newman's Theory of Assent; The Nature of Faith; The Genesis of Faith in the Individual; and The Sources of Newman's Psychology of Faith; to which are added an extended Bibliography and an Appendix containing cited references and critical notes.

Dr. Juergens (professor of Religion and Classical Languages at Maryhurst Normal, Kirkwood, Missouri), points out the two outstanding contributions of Cardinal Newman to modern Catholic apologetics: 1) the theory of the Evolution of Dogma which has become "the Church's most effective counter weapon against Protestantism and the dissolvent rationalism of the Modernists" and 2) the theory of harmony between Natural and Revealed Religion "as constituting the average man's implicit, and at the same time strongest motive of credibility." It is the latter contribution contained chiefly in the *Oxford University Sermons* and

the *Grammar of Assent* which furnishes the proper setting for a study of Newman's psychology of the individual's faith and with which this book deals.

Ordinary folk reach certitude on the unique worth and supernatural character of Christianity, according to Newman, not by logical demonstration, nor by an appeal to such external evidences as written records, testimonies, signs or miracles (however valuable these may be as supplementations), but rather through an ordinary psycholyogical process. The *terminus a quo* of this process lies with an original datum, a possession of every normal individual, viz., conscience. An analysis of this datum together with its effects furnishes the key to an appreciative understanding of both ethics and religion. Conscience (nowhere adequately defined) exhibits two distinct functions: the moral sense which is an original judgment that discerns right from wrong; and the sense which, in turn, brings either an inner praise or blame in accordance with achievement or failure. Now, the moral sense would be a perfect guide were it not for original sin and obscurities which attend habitual trifling and neglect. Nevertheless, imperfect and clouded as it may be, it forms the basis for the wide recognition among men of codes of moral discernment. Expressed in systematic form, this recognition becomes "the science of Morals and Ethics." The sense of duty, on the other hand, "leads man spontaneously and instinctively to refer it to a Being outside of himself" which forms the basis of Natural Religion. Repeated failure to perform acts which give inner approval and the readiness to perform such as awaken self-censure command implicitly the recognition of a breach between man and the Judge (or God) who is presented in the experience of disapproval. Fear follows together with a desire for reconciliation. Man becomes therefore sensitive for some sign of acquittal and restoration on the part of the Being who must accordingly be both "fearfully just" and "supremely good."

This "Natural Religion," according to Newman, is universal among folk who are normal and who have not fallen into the hopeless and perverted state of ignoring or refusing to accept the datum of conscience in their inner life. A certain doctrinal content is implicit in Natural Religion: existence of God; man's dependence upon and responsibility to God; a sense of breach (sin) and need for reconciliation; expectation of some sign of restoration, etc. (pp. 169-170). Such Religions are regarded false which fail to recognize these fundamental "teachings of conscience."

The whole point of this psychological analysis leads up to the consideration of Revealed Religion as not only in entire harmony with the data of Natural Religion but the perfect realization of all that is implicit in the latter. If a man be honest with his own conscience, then, he will find, according to Newman, that Christianity is not only not unreasonable but the perfect sign and ad-

justment to which that same conscience has all along been pointing. Certitude, then, rests back upon the original datum. The final criterion of the worth and the unique value of Revealed Religion is to be found *within* rather than without.

It would not be difficult to find fault with Newman's analysis and viewpoint either on psychological or philosophical grounds. Keen as is that analysis, it is strikingly artificial. His concept of Natural Religion is surely dogmatic and hardly fair to the facts revealed by a study of either historic or comparative religion. His notion of Revealed Religion is identified with a particular type of theology. In fact, for him Catholicism *en toto* seems to reach back into the very fibre of man's psychological nature! (Cf. p. 191 ff.). His conception of what is essential Christianity is of course highly disputable. Yet, for all that, many favorable comments might be made on Newman, *e. eg.*, his shift of emphasis in apologetics from external authority as such to experience will hardly be criticized by those who hold the modern point of view in religion. We may well ask what he means by "conscience." In turn, he may well ask what many modern ethicists mean by the "moral consciousness" or perhaps what modern theologians and philosophers of religion mean by "religious consciousness" or even "religious experience." Finally, it is to be noted that, after all, his psychology of faith is a testimony of his own experience, however inadequately expressed, and that the *Oxford Sermons* and the *Grammar* present "the autobiography of his mind and heart."

VERGILIUS FERM

Cosmology. By J. A. McWilliams. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1928. x + 243 pages; index. $2.50.

The publishers introduce the author as "Professor of Cosmology" in St. Louis University. The book is a compendium evidently, of class lectures and notes; its treatment is highly systematic and succinct, the subject-matter arranged under paragraph themes, theses, major and minor arguments, corollaries, replies to alleged difficulties, topics for discussion, and references (largely from Catholic apologetic sources). The stamp of approval on the fly-leaf of the book by officials in the church (the usual form: *Nihil Obstat* and *Imprimatur*) serves as a warrant to the reader that no revolutionary doctrine is to be expected within its pages, that the novel in modern science and philosophy must somehow be correlated with accepted ecclesiastical tradition or else disavowed, and that, as before, philosophy is still the handmaiden of theology.

True to form, then, the book is a theological metaphysics. Non-Catholic readers will find the book of interest perhaps chiefly because it indicates the character of the philosophy that is being expounded in a modern Catholic university; it reveals how

some of the significant data of modern science and current metaphysical notions derived from these are being correlated with an older tradition; and it reflects the thoroughgoing way in which a modern Catholic apologetic is being constructed. We may well disagree with the underlying deductive procedure and with many of the inferences thus drawn in the book; nevertheless we can hardly fail to respect the critical acumen and the great amount of erudition with which the author brings to bear upon the facts and theories brought under discussion. As is to be expected, the names of Aristotle and St. Thomas Aquinas figure conspicuously throughout.

A few of the points of view defended might well be set down: the theory of inorganic evolution is not incompatible with either theism, creationism, or even the Genesis account; the material universe affords sufficient evidence for the doctrine of intelligent design; physical and moral laws give evidence of intelligent regulation; miracles are not only possible but actual and recognizable; time and space while issuing as products of mind, nevertheless, are grounded in objective reality; necessity which rules the events of the material world is not absolute; the various types of inorganic matter as they occur in nature cannot be explained except by substantial form; pure spirits, or angels, it is possible to hold, not only exist but may effect intervention in the forces of nature; "the intrinsic end or purpose of human nature is to possess true good and happiness; our nature is constituted with that objective in view.... In the conferring of this true good and happiness God finds his greater glory. That glory therefore is the ultimate extrinsic end of mankind"; and so on.

VERGILIUS FERM

The Catholic Church and Confession. ("The Calvert Series." Edited by Hilaire Belloc.) By Leonard Geddes and Herbert Thurston. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1928. 104 pages. $1.00.

The present revival of interest in the mystical aspects of religion together with the proclamations of Protestant prophets in high places of the unique value of the confessional, make one pause respectfully before such a book as this. For, whatever else we may say about Catholicism, we can hardly escape the conviction that both its dogma clothed with supernaturalism and its ecclesiastical technique provide an atmosphere which easily fans into flame whatever spark of mysticism may be found among its devotees. The sacrament of penance which begins with confession and culminates in the magical words of the vicar, *Ego te absolvo*, surely is an achievement in mystical art, and continues to function effectively as an answer to certain human needs.

However, it is not this psychological function to which these

Catholic apologists appeal in setting forth the worth of this institution and practice. Rather, they would rest their case upon a certain theology and ecclesiology than upon any psychology. Curiously enough, the weakest arguments in the book become for them the strongest; and, conversely, the strongest become for them the weakest. The *raison d'etre* of confession (like other Catholic dogma) is intimately bound up with a theory of the church which in turn rests upon certain Scriptural declarations and traditional practices. This, their strongest argument, according to them, rests (it is almost too trite to remark) upon sparse and isolated Biblicisms to which are applied highly questionable exegeses.

On the other hand, a final chapter is given over to an evaluation of confession on the basis of "reason and experience," which, for non-Catholic readers, forms the most convincing part of the apology. The long-hallowed practice has justified itself not only before the tribunal of individuals as such, but of society as well. It has acted as a moral restraint upon human conduct with far-reaching implications to social welfare. It has kept alive the voice of conscience which has saved men from living together in "fools' paradises." The performance of works of satisfaction imposed by the confessor reaches out into the very world where wrongs have been committed and where they must be righted. Moreover, the individual is forced to take a moral inventory of himself repeatedly. He is saved from the tragedy of self-complacency and hypocrisy not only by the requirement to confess but to confess all, under penalties provided for. He is given a place and a way to unburden himself. He is not thrown upon the mercy of ill-advised amateurs and quacks but is given access to funded wisdom by experts trained to administer relief and counsel. In this way, the church secures its most vital contacts and learns how to carry on an effective program. And so, there is "no school of morality equal to the confessional." In fact, confession "is a gift of such far-reaching beneficence that it may well be believed, from that mark alone in all its circumstances, to have God for its author."

VERGILIUS FERM

Old Faith and New Knowledge. By James H. Snowden. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1928. 279 pages. $2.50.

Dr. Snowden is widely known as the author of a series of annual volumes on the Sunday school lessons, and a score of other works besides. In the present book he concerns himself with a description of modernism, using the word in a religious sense. Occupying himself with two main problems, first, the relation of science and religion, and second, the presence of modernism in the

Old and New Testaments and in church history, he covers the field comprehensively.

Defining modernism as "the principle and progressive process of continually unifying our growing experience in knowledge and life," the author's thesis is that modernism has always been operative in the history of religion. Abraham, Moses, Jesus, Stephen, Paul, the Church Fathers, the Reformers, and many others along the way, were modernists, seeking to recast religion to fit the expanding horizons of their eras. He even includes as modernistic, the early Councils, the scholastics, and the divisions of Protestantism.

In the several chapters on science and religion Dr. Snowden seeks to delimit the field of each, show their conflict in the past, and indicate their proper adjustment to each other. One of the book's most interesting chapters is that on Historic Conflicts Between Theology and Science, in which one is told that the earth's rotundity and the Copernican theory were as bitterly opposed in their day as evolution has been more recently. The proper relation between science and religion the author finds in the fundamental unity of the world, wherein they both must be recognized as essential factors.

Dr. Snowden in this book reveals all the virtues and vices of the typical modernist. He is broadminded in spirit and temperate in assertion, seeing clearly that though the expression of religion may change, its essence is not necessarily vitiated. But at the same time he is hazy and uncritical. The reader will find little in the book that is original, or up-to-date, or very accurate. It is a sort of popular work, punctuated by platitudes and similies and quotations and recent dates, but lacking insight into critical and scientific problems as they actually are to-day. Furthermore, the degree of his modernism is indefinite. He gives an opiate to the person whose childhood theology irritates him; but he does no clear constructive thinking to help the one whose difficulty is not childhood obsessions but confusion in the face of the modern thought situation. He is a modernist with reference to biblical criticism, a fundamentalist when it comes to the customs of communist Russia. He advocates progress in creeds, but closes his own work comfortingly with the ancient Apostles' Creed.

An illustration of the author's uncritical approach may be noted in his discussion of the Decalogue, which he assumes to have reached its present form *before* Moses' time instead of after. Again, in the treatment of the conflicts between science and religion, he discusses at great length evolution, which has really passed from the scholar's sanctuary to the halls of legislation, and entirely ignores those present developments in psychology, sociology, and ethics, which tend to be utterly destructive of religion.

Dr. Snowden's book may be of real use to the novice who seeks an introduction to modernism, what it stands for, and especially the attitude it represents. His tone of faith, optimism, and confidence in religion will prove of help to some who are fearful of the collapse of all religion. For such what the book lacks in clear thinking may be more than compensated by its wide scope and diffuse information.

THEODORE K. FINCK

Outlines of the Psychology of Religion. By Horatio W. Dresser. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Company, 1929. xiii + 451 pages; index. $3.00.

One's hopes (and fears) are immediately aroused by the announcement of a new volume on the psychology of religion. Students of the subject know full well that there is a woeful lack of reliable books in this field. We have important monographs but as yet hardly a satisfactory up-to-date treatment, in English, of the whole subject. The volume before us is just another disappointment.

Written by one of the conspicuous and able leaders in America of the so-called New Thought movement, this volume presents a mixture of theology, metaphysics, ethics, psychology and religion under the wholly questionable title of a *Psychology* of Religion. One can hardly refrain from offering the cruel criticism of saying that here is a book frankly too ponderous for the layman, too superficial for the specialist and too confusing for the untrained student of religion. Nowadays we expect to separate the treatment of psychology from philosophy even as we separate the disciplines of science and philosophy. Mixing description with interpretation is hopelessly confusing to uncritical students and wholly bad practice to those who believe that problems should be carefully distinguished.

Throughout we find here gleanings from well-known writers of well-known books with a strong bias in the selection of those philosophical in character. Psychological analyses follow the paths already beaten out by such investigators as James, Starbuck, Pratt, Thouless, Flower, etc.

In this connection it might be well to offer a suggestion to those who desire to read a carefully prepared monograph in this field. I would recommend the careful reading of Flower's *The Psychology of Religion* (Harcourt, Brace & Co., 1927), a treatment by a specialist in the field and one which throws much light on the psychological approach to the study of religion. It rests on sound psychological data and is a fresh treatment of the subject.

VERGILIUS FERM

CHURCH HISTORY

The Lutheran Churches of the World. Edited by Prof. Alfred Th. Jorgensen, Copenhagen, Denmark; High Church Councilor F. Fleisch, Hanover, Germany; Prof. Abdel Ross Wentz, Gettysburg, Pa. Published for the Executive Committee of the Lutheran World Convention. Minneapolis, Minn.: The Augsburg Publishing House, 1929. 432 pages. German edition, *Die Lutherischen Kirchen der Welt in unseren Tagen.* Verlag von Dorffling und Franke, 1929. Scandinavian edition, *De Lutherske Kirke Verden ober.* Kjobenhaven: O. Lohse.

The Lutheran Churches of the World for the first time officially gives the result of the census of the Lutheran churches of Europe; America, North, Central, and South; Asia, Africa, and Australia. The pioneer attempt at such a census was made by Dr. J. N. Lenker in the eighties of the last century and published in *Lutherans in All Lands.* The second attempt was made by the National Lutheran Council in 1925, the result being printed in summarized form in the Lutheran World Almanac for 1924-26, under the section heading "The Lutheran Church of the World." Both of these attempts, excellent and serviceable as they were at the time, were unofficial in that they were not made by the Lutheran church of the world as such.

By this survey, in its tri-language editions and under its tri-language editorship, all of the Lutheran churches of the world have been placed under definite obligation to the Lutheran World Convention and its Executive Committee. It is a distinct, definite, and observable achievement, definitely proving the value of such a world organization and outlook.

The volume is divided into three books: Book I is Europe; Book II is America; and Book III is Asia, Africa, and Australia; with a statement of the origin and purpose of the book, a preface to the various editions, a conclusion on World Lutheranism, and an index. The statements, descriptive of the church in each of the countries, follow a definite outline based upon a uniform questionaire as to (I) the church itself, its size, constitution, organization, history, officers, or heads, etc.; (II) the work of the church giving parochial statistics, its educational work, publications, distribution of Bibles, papers, authors, Sunday schools, inner missions and charity, foreign missions, etc.; (III) the state of the church: the origin of the church in the given country, its leaders of the past, the part that the church plays along with the state in the performance of marriage, the education of its ministry, the salary of its ministers, church attendance, the influence of the church upon the general culture of the country.

This work by its very nature and character is encyclopedic and yet, because of its subject, can and should be, unlike a dictionary,

read, if possible, at one sitting. It will remain an indispensable reference book. It should be in every library and upon the desk of every Lutheran pastor throughout the world, as well as of every individual who would know and understand the genius and character of the Lutheran churches of the world and the history of the efforts at international and world-wide vision and organization.

The English edition bears the earmarks of translation and insufficient proof reading, which, in all probability, is to be explained as the result of the haste with which the compilation was carried through in order to be in readiness for distribution at the second Lutheran World Convention, June 26-July 4, 1929. A glossary of abbreviations might have been helpful.

The statistics of a number of the countries show a decided increase over the latest reports of 1925. However, perhaps the restricted definition of membership without a doubt properly used throughout the book, may not have revealed the full strength of the Lutheran church in some of the countries such as Norway, where a decided discrepancy in the membership is shown as compared with the most recent state censuses available. While the Lutherans within the Union churches throughout Europe properly could not have been included in a work of this kind, might it not have been well to have, however, under each of the countries, pointed out in a small paragraph their existence and probable number so as to have presented a more complete picture of Lutheranism for each of the countries?

But none of the minor defects which must be noted in a review of this character prevent glimpsing the picture of the great Lutheran churches, or church of the world, which, after all, is the purpose of this work. May every Lutheran know this work and become conscious of and justly proud of the Church of the Reformation.

G. L. KIEFFER

The Church and the Russian Revolution. By Matthew Spinka, A.M., Ph.D., Librarian and Professor in the Chicago Theological Seminary. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1927. 330 pages. $2.50.

Throughout the entire Christian church, there is at present intense interest in Eastern Christianity because of the great afflictions through which it has been called upon to pass in recent years. Among all the churches of the East which have suffered from the World War and succeeding revolutions, the churches of Russia are outstanding. Will the Orthodox church in that country survive the revolution, and what of the future of Christianity in the former Empire of the Czars? Dr. Spinka's book, *The Church and the Russian Revolution,* is an important contribution to the literature

of the subject. This enthusiastic young scholar has produced a book which, to one interested in current ecclesiastical affairs and movements, reads like a novel. Commanding the Russian language, the author has not limited his investigations to books but has visited Russia for conference with governmental and church leaders and the examination of original documents. His treatment is in harmony with the modern historical method and is in the main objective in character, although his choice and presentation of material are naturally to some extent influenced by his theological presuppositions.

The book contains twelve chapters: The Roots of the Matter, Between the Two Revolutions (1905-1917); The March Revolution (1917); The First All-Russian Local Sobor of 1917; The First Years of the Soviet Régime; The Soviet Ecclesiastical Legislation; The Famine and Its Consequences; The Origin of the Schism; The Second All-Russian Local Sobor; A House Divided Against Itself; The Present Situation; Conclusion; to all of which is added a fairly complete Bibliography.

The Orthodox Church and the Russian Revolution would have been a title truer to its contents than the one chosen by the author, since, as it appears from the table of contents, the other independent Christian churches of Russia are referred to only incidentally. The chief value of the book will be found in its concentration upon the study of the Russian Orthodox church as an ecclesiastical organization, including particularly its incorporation in the system of Russian autocracy during the régime of the Czars, its culminating conflict with the forces of the revolution after the World War, the overthrow of the old order, the divisions, the tendencies to disintegration, and the struggle to achieve reorganization under the Soviet régime. Source material of the greatest value on these and other topics bearing upon the ecclesiastical situation in Russia is supplied. The main weakness of the book lies in its failure to develop the rich background of the specific subject of which it treats:—(a) the sources of spiritual vitality the Russian Orthodox church possesses in common with Christianity as a whole, (b) the elements of biblical Christianity manifest within it for many generations, and (c) the wholesome interaction of the churches of other confessions in Russia.

As to (a), for example, in speaking of "The Roots of the Matter," Dr. Spinka characterizes the Christianity of the Russian church as "petrified Byzantinism, redolent with mystical piety and superstitious ceremonialism, essentially medieval, other-worldly, ascetic, and mythological.... Fundamentally, it differed but little, as far as the temper of its doctrine was concerned, from Western Catholicism; it regarded the dogmas of the church as 'revealed truth,' and as such they were held to be absolutely without error, unsusceptible of either addition, subtraction, development, or re-

interpretation. The belief in these dogmas was necessary to salvation; the sacraments were regarded as mediating objective grace in a truly magical manner and were defined essentially in the Roman Catholic sense." But however great the errors of its dogmas and the abuses of its superstitious teachings and practices, the Russian Orthodox church adheres essentially to the ecumenical creed confessed in common by the entire Christian church. No small part of the objective truth of the Gospel of Christ is thus held and confessed. Whatever may have been the vitiating influence of false dogma and superstitious practices, many of the truths of the Gospel have found their way to the people and have been manifest in the music, hymnology, worship, and lives of the people of the Orthodox church.

Regarding (b), particular attention is called to the numerous recent writings of Dr. Koch, professor in the Protestant Theological Seminary in Vienna, who is master of the Russian and Polish languages. He is making a thorough study of the Christianity of Russia, particularly in the Ukraine. Professor Koch asserts "that Protestantism has formed entire epochs of the Ukranian spiritual history and has lent to them its color by creating an evangelical trend." In evidence of this thesis, Prof. Koch calls attention to influential personalities in Ukranian church history who were prophets of the biblical spirit. Dr. Theophan Prokopowitsch (b. 1677), rector of the theological academy at Kiew and later bishop of Pskow, the spiritual adviser of Peter the Great, was a theologian of devout faith. He subscribed to the Lutheran principle of justification by faith alone, denied the authority of tradition and of the councils and taught the full authority of the Holy Scriptures. "Through his teachings," says Prof. Koch, "entire generations of Ukrainian clergymen were educated in the Protestant spirit." G. Skoworoda (b. 1722), "the wandering philosopher," whose prose and poetic writings contain much biblical material, has remained a popular author among the Ukrainian people. Similarly, Taras Schwetschenko (b. 1814), the most prominent poet of Little Russia, was greatly influenced by the Bible in all of his literary work. Among all Ukrainian versions of the Bible, that of P. Kulisch, who spent twenty years at this task, is distinguished for "the beauty of its language and its exactitude." These and many other personalities, works and influences have been instrumental in creating within the Orthodox church of Russia evangelical or biblical trends tending to modify greatly in the faith and life of the people the dead orthodoxy and abuses in practice to which Dr. Spinka refers. Perhaps it should not be altogether a surprise, therefore, to learn that when the deluge of the Russian revolution came, the fruit of this evangelical or biblical element in the Russian Orthodox church should manifest itself in the strivings for reorganization of Christianity free from the state. In this connection,

although it post-dates the production of Dr. Spinka's book, should be mentioned Prof. Koch's portrayal of the manifestation of "the biblical spirit" in the Second Ukrainian Synod of October, 1927, by various provisions. Especially notable is the eleventh canon adopted by this Synod in part as follows: "The Ukrainian Orthodox-Autokephal Church is a free, brotherly union of believing people....it is established on the basis of true understanding of the Holy Gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ"—a statement whose wording strikingly approaches that of the seventh article of the Augsburg Confession.

Concerning (c), the book under review fails by way of developing its background in adequately showing the influence of the Evangelical Lutheran church in Russia upon the Orthodox church. From the days of Catherine the Great, without the slightest endeavor to alienate its people from the orthodox communion, Lutheran pastors have conducted Bible "hours" or classes among the religiously ignorant Russian people of the communities in which they served their own congregations. Thus arose the *Stundist* movement within the Russian church. Lutheran and other Protstant schools were centers of like biblical or evangelical influence. The Baptist church of Russia without as well as the so-called sectarian movements within the Russian Orthodox church have also been constant witnesses to biblical evangelical truth.

However, notwithstanding certain evidences of immaturity and incompleteness in Dr. Spinka's book (perfectly understandable because of the greatness of the subject and the inaccessibility in the West of vast material concerning the church of the East), in producing *The Church and the Russian Revolution* he has made an invaluable contribution to the literature of this subject, particularly in view of the undocumented, unreliable, and conflicting character of so much that has been written about Russian Christianity since the World War.

As suggestively supplemental, in concluding this review, attention is called to the thesis discussed in a recent series of articles by the Lutheran theologian, Prof. Koch: "The crisis in the church life of the European East is marked (1) by the decentralization of the old Greek Orthodox Russian National Church, (2) by a strengthening of the Roman Catholic attempts for union with the Orthodox Church, (3) by a new wave of Protestant revivals."

Nevertheless the Orthodox church of Russia itself, refined, purified and led back to God and his Gospel of salvation in Jesus Christ by the fiery trial through which it is passing, may well be confidently expected to renew its strength and to be called to have a great part in the future of Christianity.

JOHN A. MOREHEAD

Dr. Martin Luther's Small Catechism. By M. Reu. Chicago: Wartburg Publishing House, 1929 vii + 426 pages; 18 plates.

This is more than a mere translation of the German work by Dr. Reu which has already been noticed in The Lutheran. Some sections which had a more largely German interest have been omitted while a considerable amount of new material has been added.

This is by far the most important and scholarly book on the Small Catechism that has appeared in this country or in the English language. It is crowded with information, much of it found nowhere else. Not only is the origin of the Catechism correctly given in the light of the most recent researches, but its distribution, the history of its use and its present status in the various parts of the world is accurately narrated. No one can peruse its pages without gaining an increased respect for the greatest small book in the world.

One feature that makes it particularly valuable is the large amount of source material that is given by way of illustration. The ordinary reader will be amazed to learn just how large a part this little manual has played in the religious life and the educational activities of the church, while the scholar will find material for study in the well chosen documentary matter that illustrates the author's statements.

JOHN C. MATTES

Francis Asbury. By William L. Duren. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1928. xviii + 370 pages. $3.00.

This is a brief but invigorating account of a strenuous life in primitive days of pioneering and privation. It is astonishing how much was pressed into the span of his life from 1745 to 1816. His was a life absurdly free from play. Great claims have been made for this "invalid prophet," "spiritual adventurer," evangelist, "knightly warrior for truth," reformer, "founder of American Methodism," "unofficial minister of state" and contributor to the social and political life of America. He "rambled throughout the United States" and within a month after his arrival in America had laid the foundation for the system of itinerant preaching.

H. D. HOOVER

RELIGIOUS EDUCATION

Religious Education and the State. By Jerome K. Jackson and Constantine F. Malmberg. New York: Doubleday, Doran and Company, 1928. 115 pages. $2.00.

Of a movement, as of a man, whither one is bound is a more vital fact than where one is.

The significant worth of this book lies in its discovery of trends in the relationship between the state and religious education. The book is built up from an extensive array of facts. And they are useful and important facts, too, whose authority is enhanced by the careful scholarship and documentation which characterizes their treatment. And yet, from the nature of the case, the facts regarding the legal status of religious education in any particular state may have changed before the volume was off the press. If the detailed data were the important contribution of this study, this would seriously affect the value of it. But the important point lies precisely in the tracing of the changes which have been under way during the present century. It is a study to determine what is happening to the legal status of religious education.

We confess that the findings of the book are more optimistic than we had anticipated. Certain experiences had led us to fear that sectarianism in the state had become so determined, and religious sentiment so divided, that progress would be made only against almost forbidding difficulty. For others who feel that way this volume will bring real encouragement.

"It is evident from the laws and decisions that Bible reading (in the public schools) from the legal point of view, has gained in favor in the United States since 1900."

"All the legislation making Bible reading obligatory has been enacted within the period of 1900-1927."

"No legislation exists in any of the states which directly forbids Bible reading," though in several states interpretations or decisions have operated to prevent it.

Likewise as to the granting of public school time for religious education, it is found that "this practice is growing in legal favor." And, furthermore, that "the practice of using public school time for religious instruction is tending to raise the standards of religious education to the levels attained by our public school systems."

Prior to 1912 there was no state giving high school credit for Bible study. But in the fifteen years thereafter the movement grew with such rapidity that "in 1927 twenty-six states were giving high school credit for Bible study. . . . Seven other states were listed as reporting some type of Bible study in their schools."

With findings like these it is not surprising that the authors conclude that "the promoters of religious education may assume greater confidence in planning for more extensive religious education with legal sanction backing their work."

It should also be noted that the work contains significant recommendations for procedure in promoting religious education. And there is a very extensive appendix containing laws, decisions, and proposed bills dealing with the status of religious education in the state.

CARL C. RASMUSSEN

The Religion of the Child. By P. E. Kretzmann, Ph.D., D.D. St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1929. 152 pages.

In a series of ten essays, the first of which has given title to the book, the author sets forth his views concerning religious education as over against those of the group whom he characterizes in a general way as modern theologians and educationalists. He finds little to be commended and much to be condemned in present day tendencies and practices. The subjects discussed are as follows: The Religion of the Child, Sound Pedagogy as Opposed to Modern Religious Vagaries, Lowering the Standards of Indoctrination, The Present Status of Parents' Rights, The Teacher as a Prime Factor in Religious Education, Adequate Indoctrination for Adults, The Question-and-Answer Method, Luther's Catechism a Pedagogical Masterpiece, A Curriculum and a Course of Study for Religious Education, Evaluating the Religious Program in a Christian School.

Dr. Kretzmann has gathered many interesting key statements from historic and contemporary writers. In dealing with these in relation to the subjects of his treatises, he has advanced favorable or adverse criticism as he felt the situations warranted. He warns against non-Christian practices into which workers in religious education have been led by so-called modern vagaries.

A few points seem to demand specific comment. 1. The ideas presented in the discussions are, in the main well founded; yet frequently the extreme form in which they are offered tends to awaken antagonism rather than endorsement. 2. Some statements, thetically advanced, need to be interpreted in the light of other sections. For example, "Religion, in its true, in its absolute sense, is knowledge, no matter how much emotional background is present" (p. 23). "A vital relation to experience is not necessarily required in religion, for the basis of religion is knowledge and not feeling" (p. 121). One may well question whether religion is complete when only knowledge is present. In other parts of the discussions, the author makes provision for intellectual, emotional, and volitional forces. 3. Other statements need to be understood in the light of the group for which the author is primarily writing. For example, "We realize that the Christian day-school is the ideal institution" (p. 53). 4. In discussing pedagogy, the author states, "the Bible is to all true Christians not only the revelation of God's grace pertaining to their salvation, but also the one volume of absolute truth in every department of human wisdom" (p. 24). It is true that many of our methods must be similar to those employed by biblical characters. This, however, is not because biblical characters have employed these methods, but because experience has demonstrated that they are most adequate for the effective teaching of God's Word. We

conceive of the Bible as fundamentally a religious book and not concerned with various departments of human wisdom.

These essays will be of interest as setting forth one view of religious education. They may well serve as a deterrent or an antidote for those who have let themselves be carried too far afield by mere speculations or theories.

O. F. NOLDE

PRACTICAL THEOLOGY

The Stewardship Life. By Karl Kretzschmar. St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1929. 208 pages. $1.00.

A very satisfactory introduction to the meaning, spirit, principles, methods, and rewards of Christian stewardship, finely written, well printed, attractively bound. Fifteen chapters, each brief, enlivened by human interest stories, substantiated by passages of Scripture, and neatly summarized by a closing paragraph, tell the truth about stewardship. There is a bit of repetition, but even that has its pedagogical value. Altogether a good little volume!

PAUL J. HOH

Concerning the Faith. By Joseph M. M. Gray. New York: The Abingdon Press, 1928. 293 pages. $2.00.

These ten essays at understanding profess to be an "approach unto." Many of the books of the day, because of the breadth of the field and the amplification of knowledge must perforce be only attempts at, approaches unto, angle-views of, excursions into, etc. Notwithstanding this, Dr. Gray's book reflects wide reading, tall thinking, fine judgment, good sense and virile Christian faith. Dr. Brown of Yale calls it a "very readable and rewarding book."

H. D. HOOVER

Present Perils of Religion. By Albert Edward Day. New York: The Abingdon Press, 1928. 215 pages. $1.25.

In this volume of sermons Dr. Day presents sincere discourses, all of which follow the plan of presenting two sides of the subject: first the merits and then the dangers thereof. There are ten discourses. The subjects are Orthodoxy, Heresy, Institutionalism, Individualism, Intellectualism, Emotionalism, Ideals, Compromise, Symbols and The Lost Chord. The development and line of thought is as timely as the subjects.

H. D. HOOVER

Preaching in the New Era. Edited by Elmore McNeil McKee. New York: Doubleday, Doran and Company, 1929. $2.50.

Here is a volume of sermons and addresses which attempt to express the message of Christianity "to men and women who are young in body and young in spirit." It is a carefully edited volume. The selection of sermons is excellent. The master preachers represented are: H. E. Fosdick, A. P. Fitch, W. L. Sperry, C. R. Brown, J. F. Newton, G. A. Buttrick, F. J. McConnell, C. W. Gilkey, E. F. Tittle, H. H. Tweedy, H. S. Coffin, R. R. Wicks, E. D. Mouzon and Hugh Black. This is one of the best volumes of contemporary sermons.

H. D. Hoover

Victim and Victor. By John Rathbone Oliver. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1928. x + 435 pages. $2.50.

Here is a novel that should appeal to clergymen. The author is a physician and psychiatrist of notable standing, a lay churchman from "the inside," and, besides, a man of rare literary taste and ability.

The hero in the story is a young Episcopal rector who for some unstated reason is caused to resign his orders and who spends a dreary life in trying to reclaim himself. The tragedy is that of a man who prepares for a task that requires years of training, only to find that in the middle of life he is not allowed by certain institutional sanctions to bring that preparation to fruition. No doubt, there are those poor souls that are *Victims* to the cold and formal practices of institutionalism and can only find themselves *Victors* by beating out a lonely path. Rev. Mr. Mann, indeed, found himself only by being compelled to give up what seemed the most precious to him. Thus also, we are reminded, was the way our Lord pointed.

Every bishop, conference president and such who are charged with an office of responsibility relating to their brethren in the ministry ought to read and reflect upon this story. To take from any man his robes, however pitiable the case, is a responsibility that few would seek. Just why did the ecclesiastical leaders refuse to take back a repentant man? Well,—that is only one of the many questions that haunt the reader of this tragic story after he has turned over the last page.

Vergilius Ferm

The Three Half-Moons. By F. W. Boreham. New York: The Abingdon Press, 1929. 288 pages. $1.75.

Those who are acquainted with Doctor Boreham's books will need no urging to read this volume. In his own inimitable style—

light, graceful, rich, varied—he gives us twenty-six short essays on life as he sees it. His spirit is broad, sympathetic, optimistic (perhaps too optimistic). His eye is clear and keen. His imagination is vivid, but sober. His experience and reading are wide. Nature, art, science, history, religion, all yield something to his pages and in everything Dr. Boreham sees spiritual suggestions and spiritual values. There is a bit of preaching here and there—and then the author is at his worst; there is more of delightful story telling—and then he is at his best. A charming volume of light, but worthwhile reading for the rest hour.

PAUL J. HOH

CORRESPONDENCE CONCERNING REVIEWS

The Interpretation of Religion. By John Baillie. Reviewed in The Lutheran Church Quarterly, Vol. II, No. 2 (April 1929), pp. 237-9. With permission of the author the following extract is published from his personal letter to the reviewer.

I thank you very warmly for the kind words you have written about my book. As regards your point of criticism. You ask me whether my position is "that the moral argument is the only valid one." To this I have to say: (1) That my whole book is a protest against this 'rationalistic' way of stating the question. There is one sense in which *no* argument is valid; by which I mean that no man ever became religious as the result of argument. (2) That I do *not* regard what is usually called the "moral argument" as being a valid and convincing piece of reasoning. The old text books state the "moral argument" as meaning that we can argue from the presence in man of a unique faculty called conscience to the existence of a supernatural Being who *implanted* it. This argument is just as antiquated as the others. (3) That I nevertheless *do* hold that the moral *approach* to religion is the only one there is. I believe nobody can ever come to understand what is meant by religion, or to know God, except through the realities of conscience and the moral life. As Herrmann says, the moral life is the only "weg zur Religion." This is the very proof of my position.

You write in your review that "if our ethics are mere conveniences of the present social order," then my approach to religion would be no more valid than the other traditional arguments. Of course not; but the question is, *Can* morality be reduced to a mere matter of convenience? It is just because I believe it cannot that I hold the ethical approach to religion to be valid.

You go on, "The same kind of assumption that makes our moral values to be founded in God, also compels us to admit that our knowledge is grounded in Supreme Intelligence." To this I say, (1) that I think you have given away your case by writing "Supreme Intelligence" instead of "God" in the second half of the

sentence, whereas you wrote "God" in the first. That is exactly my point (and Kant's), that whereas the theistic arguments *may* point to "a Supreme Intelligence," only the ethical approach can give you "God"—a Personality, a *moral* Personality. I have argued at length that a "Supreme Intelligence" is not enough for religion to make the barest start on; and that as a matter of fact, historically, it was not from this end that religion ever *tried* to start. Actually, men believed that the Reality at the back of things was on the side of their *values*, before it occurred to them that it was "an Intelligence." If you glance again at pp. 96-104 of my book, you will see that I have said all this at length. (2) That, accordingly, whether or not it is possible to reach "God" through a logical argument from the nature of our intelligence to a Supreme Intelligence, the theologian as such is not directly interested in that argument, because it is certainly not by that approach that practical religion has reached God.

And you must remember that the reason I give in my book for my dissatisfaction with the old theistic proofs is not that they are invalid in the sense of not correctly proving *anything*, but rather that what they do prove is not enough, or of a kind, to be of use to religion. The critical question for religion is not "Does a Supreme Intelligence exist?" but "Is the Supreme Reality *good?*"—or, one might almost say, "Is *love* the reallest thing in the world?" It is because this is the real essence of religious faith that the moral approach to faith is the only one that is valid in its own independent right.

JOHN BAILLIE

Christian Symbolics. By E. H. Klotsche. Reviewed in The Lutheran Church Quarterly, Vol. II, No. 3 (July 1929), pp. 385-7. The author's criticism of the review and the reviewer's reply:

The Lutheran Church Quarterly of July 1929 has published a review of my latest publication *Christian Symbolics*. The criticism offered by the reviewer, the Rev. Theodore K. Finck, appears to me in more than one respect very unfair. It misrepresents my book and reflects on my person as a teacher of the Lutheran church.

Relative to the form and arrangement of the material the reviewer maintains that "the author is not always clear and systematic in arranging and developing his outlines. Frequently his material is presented in a haphazard fashion...." In the author's presentation of the doctrines of the Lutheran church, according to the reviewer, "the tone of censure gives way to uncritical approval of everything." The reviewer criticizes the author for "zealously elaborating" controversies about biblical doctrines which, according to the reviewer are "futile and meaningless," or which "have lost significance." In one instance, a biblical view held by the author is styled by the reviewer as "a little

medieval." The following paragraph caps the climax of the reviewer's animadversions: "... the author's attitude toward non-Lutheran teachings is rather indefensible. 'Everything I say is right, everything you say is wrong'—that expresses his outlook. There is no effort to be impartial, to see the other denomination's angle, to recognize the contribution that each may make to the understanding of the Bible. Dr. Klotsche, bewailing the many sects, is himself sectarian in point of view."

The reviewer's adverse judgment upon the author and his book forms a striking contrast to the very favorable reception accorded the author's book so far by fourteen prominent theologians all of them being known as competent judges in the field of theology. They all are unanimous in differing diametrically from the reviewer in their estimate of the author's book. To quote from only two of them: "... Every Lutheran college and seminary library must needs obtain this unusually well arranged, plain, sound, comprehensive and informing handbook. The treatment comes in an objective manner..." (Dr. A. Hult, Prof. in Augustana Seminary, Rock Island, Ill.). "It has been a delight to examine this book. the treament is scholarly, comprehensive, systematically arranged, and thoroughly Lutheran in its conception. It is a most valuable contribution to the literature on Symbolics in the English language. I am so well pleased with this book that I have decided to use it as a text book next year. I have decided also to drop my plans for the preparation of a text book in Symbolics, at least for the time being" (Dr. G. M. Bruce, Prof. in Luther Theological Seminary, St. Paul, Minn.).

In addition to these testimonies of others the author has to offer a few statements of his own regarding his doctrinal views which seem to differ from those expressed by the reviewer. I believe and confess that the Bible is the inspired Word of God and hence the Book of final authority in matters of faith and practice. It is therefore for us to approach the Bible not only "openmindedly," as the reviewer suggests, but with reverence and simple faith, a surrendered will, and an obedient spirit, beseeching the Holy Spirit to open unto us the Scriptures and lead us into all truth. Only then, in the clear light of divine revelation, are we in a position rightly to judge "the opinions of others and ourselves." Unionists, liberalists, indifferentists, modernists and the like, all claim "to approach the Scriptures openmindedly," and yet with all their so-called openmindedness they often fail to see fundamental truths clearly revealed in the Scriptures or even deny and reject these truths. Wherever the Bible speaks there remains for a Lutheran but one thing, that is, complete, unconditional, and undivided acceptance. For this reason divine truths as revealed in Scripture—and the doctrine of "man's nature before the Fall" is one of these truths—have never "lost significance" to me nor can I regard a discussion of these truths as "futile and meaningless." Biblical

truths are to me not dead dogmas, but vital verities which I believe with all my heart, confess, preach and teach even though I may appear "to the mind of today" as being "a little medieval" or even "sectarian in point of view."

The unbiased reader of my book will notice that I nowhere claim infallibility of my own interpretations, as the reviewer asserts, but I do claim infallibility for the clear teachings of the Word of God. I therefore repudiate this assertion of the reviewer as well as his flippant statement: " 'Everything I say is right, everything you say is wrong'—that expresses his outlook." I likewise repudiate the reviewer's comment on the closing words of my book: Here we stand, we cannot do otherwise; God help us! Amen. The reviewer says: "These closing words advocate the precise principle which has lain back of almost all of Christianity's schisms." I regard this comment as unworthy of any one who claims to be a follower of Luther. The Lutheran church is not a sect, nor are Luther and his followers sectarians. If other denominations and sects are just as good as my church it would be wrong for me, yea sinful, to plant and build up the Lutheran church, for that would be—to use the words of the reviewer—continuing schisms and thwarting the Master's prayer "that they all may be one."

"The author's attitude toward non-Lutheran teachings" which according to the reviewer "is rather indefensible" has been approved and appreciated by other reviewers. Dr. J. T. Mueller, Prof. in Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, says: "The subject is one to which attention must be paid with special emphasis at this time of doctrinal indifferentism and unionism, when doctrinal differences are so universally set aside and treated with scorn, even when they are fundamental. The time has arrived when all faithful pastors of the Lutheran church in particular must return to the diligent study of God's Word and the Lutheran Confessions, comparing them with the teachings of other denominations in order to find out where the difference lies. In this study Dr. Klotsche's book is a great aid."

As regards minor details of the reviewer's adverse criticism I mention only one. The reviewer apparently has thought it a matter of importance to call attention to the author's capitalization of "our Fathers." I might just as well call attention to the reviewer's capitalization of "the Fall" in spite of the fact that he believes that "quarrels over man's nature before the Fall... have lost significance." The reviewer seems to think that our Fathers receive undue prominence by capitalization. That there is in this case no partiality on my part is evident from the fact that "the Catholic Fathers" and "the Tridentine Fathers" likewise have been accorded due recognition by capitalization.

E. H. KLOTSCHE

Fremont, Nebraska,
August 28, 1929.

THE REVIEWER REPLIES:

I am deeply sorry that anything in my review of *Christian Symbolics* gave offense to its author. Since the criticism was written in a purely objective spirit, and says much that is favorable, I was entirely unprepared for the kind of rejoinder which it has called forth.

In view of Dr. Klotsche's closing paragraph above, I concede that my parenthesis concerning his capitalization might well have been omitted. Other than that I do not see anything even in his protest, let alone the review itself, to support the contention that my review "misrepresents" his book. I believe the general reader can see from Dr. Klotsche's rebuttal that my comments were not unfair to his work. His real objection seems to be that the attitude, or standpoint, from which his book was considered, differs rather sharply from its author's—surely a reviewer's privilege. He does not deny, for instance, that he has neglected "the mind of today," or that he may appear "a little medieval" (an adjective used to characterize only his objection to women teaching publicly in the church); he simply gives reasons for taking the position with which the review credits him.

The gist of this difficulty (for the reviewer) may be said to lie in the opening paragraph of the Conclusion of the book, page 399: "Such is divided Christendom—by schisms rent asunder, by heresies distressed. No Christian can study the divisions in the church without deeply deploring them and profoundly feeling the need of unity among Christians. How can this unity be established?" In these words the author seems to indicate that he too feels that the present divided state of the Christian church, whether or not it could be avoided, is inherently deplorable. Since the subject with which his book deals is none other than a comparison of the teachings of these various divisions, the question arises, Will the author's unifying aspiration manifest itself in the way in which he deals with his problem? If he grieves over divisions in the church, as his quoted paragraph certainly implies, treatment of the subject might be expected to be such as would encourage unity. Is that expectation fulfilled?—This seems to be our point of difference.

For Dr. Klotsche, as his protest clearly shows again, adopts just the point of view which I sought to express in the words: "Everything I say is right, everything you say is wrong" (words applied to the author, not as an individual, but as an exponent of Lutheranism). He does not admit the student's axiom that all propositions are equally right until one is shown to be better than the rest. He does not pursue his problem as a search for truth. He does not concern himself to weigh Lutheran teachings objectively on the basis of their biblical worth. Deploring disunion on page 399, on page 400 he takes his stand unalterably in favor of the

"phrases" which are found—not in the Bible—but in the Lutheran confessions. For him Lutheran teachings, the Lutheran symbols, are right, just because they are Lutheran; and non-Lutheran teachings are wrong just because they are non-Lutheran.

Dr. Klotsche nobly writes : "I believe and confess that the Bible is the inspired Word of God and hence the Book of final authority in matters of faith and practice. It is therefore for us to approach the Bible not only 'openmindedly,' as the reviewer suggests, but with reverence and simple faith, a surrendered will, and an obedient spirit, beseeching the Holy Spirit to open unto us the Scriptures and lead us into all truth. Only then, in the clear light of divine revelation, are we in a position rightly to judge 'the opinions of others and ourselves.'" The reviewer heartily agrees. But if we insist on retaining even the "phrases" of Lutheran confessions, how can we feel that we are approaching the Bible with "an obedient spirit, beseeching the Holy Spirit to ... lead us into all truth," any more than can the unionists, liberalists, etc., with their set of preconceptions? And the crux of the matter is this. When we approach the Scriptures genuinely with "an obedient spirit," etc., we provide a common meeting ground for all Christian groups, and thus foster true unity. But when we approach the Scriptures determined to find nothing in them but the ratification of our own confessions, we make impossible any rapproachment at all with others; because, as we very well know, each one of the other groups has also its way of convincing itself that its tenets are the only correct interpretation of the Bible.

I would not be interested in challenging Dr. Klotsche's presentation of Lutheranism, if he had written in reference to unity: "A Christian can study the divisions in the church without deeply deploring them, profoundly feeling that it is God's purpose to accept the Lutheran church and reject all the others." But writing as he did, I could not and can not help remonstrating that his attitude in pursuing his subject is inconsistent with his love of a united Christian church.

He puts to my hand a pertinent illustration. He quotes three reviewers who are unanimous in praising the spirit and method of his work. They are all Lutherans, members of three different synods; they commend and share Dr. Klotsche's attitude. But the attitude they unite in praising may possibly be just the attitude that is keeping apart not only the synods they represent but also the fifteen or sixteen others that should fly the common flag of Lutheranism.

The author regards one remark of mine as "unworthy of anyone who claims to be a follower of Luther." He writes as if I applied this remark to the famous words of Luther, with which his book closes: "Here we stand, we cannot do otherwise; God help us! Amen." But the author had used these words to rein-

force his own literal adherence to the confessions. No one more than I admires Luther for his courageous stand at the Diet of Worms. But whether to use the traditional words of his ultimatum to uphold a certain usage of the confessions, is a question at least permitting of difference of opinion among Luther's loyal followers today.

His position, I must insist, wars with itself. He esteems Christian unity, yet regards Christian teachings and confessions in such a way as to prevent its progress. I too esteem Christian unity—and our Lutheran confessions—and the author of *Christian Symbolics*. And I would like to see them in closer triple harmony.

THEODORE K. FINCK

St. Petersburg, Florida,
September 13, 1929.

BOOKS RECEIVED

For the information of its readers and in acknowledgment to the publishers *The Lutheran Church Quarterly* publishes the following list of books received. More extended notice will be given later to as many of them as space permits.

Cripps, Richard S., *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Amos.* Macmillan, 1929. 365 pages. $4.50.

Dalman, Gustaf, *Jesus-Jeshua.* (Studies in the Gospels). Macmillan, 1929. 256 pages. $4.50.

Davies, J. Newton, *Rightly Dividing the Word.* Abingdon Press, 1929. 299 pages. $2.00.

Gautrey, R. Moffat, *The Glory of Going On.* Abingdon Press, 1929. 155 pages. $1.00.

Grammar, Carl E., *Things That Remain.* Macmillan, 1929. 219 pages. $1.75.

Grimm, H. J., *Martin Luther as a Preacher.* Lutheran Book Concern, 1929. 136 pages. $1.50.

Hawkins, Chauncey J., *Do the Churches Dare?* Macmillan, 1929. 174 pages. $1.50.

Hayes, Doremus A., *The Heights of Christian Living.* Abingdon Press, 1929. 312 pages. $2.00.

Hites, Laird T., *The Effective Christian College.* Macmillan, 1929. 259 pages. $2.00.

Holmes, Arthur, *The Mind of St. Paul.* Macmillan, 1929. 263 pages, $2.00.

Hughes, Maldwyn, *Basic Beliefs.* Abingdon Press, 1929. 232 pages. $1.50.

Immanuel Hymnal. Macmillan, 1929. 580 hymns; Responsive Readings; Indices. $1.75.

Jordan, W. G., *The Book of Job: Its Substance and Spirit.* Macmillan, 1929. 193 pages. $2.00.

König, Eduard, *Das Buch Hiob.* Gütersloh: Bertelsmann, 1929. 510 pages. 22 M.

König, Eduard, *Die Wahrheit der alttestamentlichen Religion.* Gütersloh: Bertelsmann, 1929. 56 pages; geh. 2 M.

Koller, Armin H., *The Foundations of Jewish Ethics.* Macmillan, 1929. 265 pages. $2.50.

Lenski, R. C. H., *Saint John.* The Lutheran Book Concern, 1929. 194 pages. $1.75.

Locke, Charles Edward, *Pray. A Manual on Prayer.* Methodist Book Concern, 1929. 186 pages. $1.00.

Lesson Commentary for Sunday Schools 1930. Editors, C. P. Wiles, Wm. L. Hunton, D. Burt Smith. United Lutheran Publication House. 316 pages. $1.75.

McDowell, William Fraser, *Them He Also Called.* Abingdon Press, 1929. 234 pages. $1.00.

Marti, Oscar, *Economic Causes of the Reformation in England.* Macmillan, 1929. 254 pages. $2.50.

Ölsner, Willi, *Die Entwicklung der Eschatologie von Schleiermacher bis zur Gegenwart.* Gütersloh: Bertelsmann, 1929. 116 pages; geh. 3.80 M; geb. 5 M.

Orchard, W. E., *The Present Crisis in Religion.* Harper Bros., 1929. 281 pages. $2.50.

Pound, J. Presley (Edited by), *Voices of the Age.* Harper Bros., 1929. 222 pages. $2.50.

Powell, John Walker, *In Search of God.* Macmillan, 1929. 159 pages. $1.50.

Richardson, Hilary G., *Life and the Book.* Macmillan, 1929. 179 pages. $1.75.

Rittelmeyer, Friedrich, *Behold The Man.* Macmillan, 1929. 167 pages. $1.75.

Roberts, George, *The Heart of Words.* Macmillan, 1929. 158 pages. $1.50.

Roberts, Richard, *The Christian God.* Macmillan, 1929. 154 pages. $1.50.

Schuh, L. H., *The Happy Family.* The Lutheran Book Concern, 1929. 203 pages. $1.25.

Schoeler, William, *Watermarks in the Gospels.* The Lutheran Book Concern, 1929. 123 pages. $0.50.

Schramm, W. E., *What Lutherans Believe.* The Lutheran Book Concern, 1929. 156 pages. $0.75.

Schmidt, H. W., *Die Christusfrage. Beitrag zu einer christlichen Geschichtsphilosophie.* Gütersloh : Bertelsmann, 1929. geh. 3 M.

Schmidt, William and Nesper, Paul W., *Under the Banner of the Snow King.* The Lutheran Book Concern, 1929. 361 pages. $1.25.

Simms, P. Marion, *The Bible from the Beginning.* Macmillan, 1929. 318 pages. $2.50.

Streeter, Canon B. H., *The Primitive Church.* Macmillan, 1929. 323 pages. $2.50.

Snowden, James H., *Outfitting the Teacher of Religion.* Macmillan, 1929. 274 pages. $2.00.

Traver, Amos John, *The Christ Who Is All.* United Lutheran Publication House, 1929. 149 pages. $1.00.

The Lord of Life (A Fresh Approach to the Incarnation). By nine authors: H. T. Andrews, Vernon Bartlet, F. C. Bryan, A. T. Cadoux, G. E. Darlaston, D. Miall Edwards, H. H. Farmer, John Lewis, and Malcolm Spencer. Macmillan, 1929. 343 pages. $2.50.

INDEX, VOLUME II

I AUTHORS

ABERLY, JOHN, German Missions in India During the War, 42-57
APPIA, LOUIS, The Lutheran Church and the Social Crisis, 437-444
BENZE, C. THEODORE, The Old Testament in Greek, 459-471
BOWMAN, EARL J., Efforts to Christianize the Indians of Pennsylvania in Colonial Times, 21-41; 190-122
DEISSMANN, ADOLF, The Historical Value of the New Testament, 257-270
DELK, EDWIN HEYL, Mental Types of Religious Thinking,155-168
ELERT, WERNER, The Church's Faith and Confession in the Light of Marburg and Augsburg, 409-427
FAULKNER, J. A., How Rome Tempted Melanchthon, 71-85
FISCHER, M. HADWIN, Finding and Facing Facts in Religious Education, 65-70
FISCHER, E. E., Some Values in the Social Gospel, 129-140
GRUBER, L. FRANKLIN, Inaugural Address (Delivered on the occasion of his inauguration as President of the Chicago Lutheran Theological Seminary, December 11, 1928), 1-20
HARRY, C. P., The Sources of Personal Religion, 141-154
HOH, PAUL J., The Practical Possibilities of Luther's Small Catechism, 58-64
HOOVER, H. D., The Worship of Saints, 303-346
JACOBS, CHARLES M., John Wycliff, 86-93
KNUBEL, FREDERICK H., The Chief Problems of Lutheran Missionary Work that Arise from the Present Situation, 393-408
KRAELING, CARL H., In Quest of the Muhlenbergiana, 180-189
MARONI, J., The Lutheran Church and the Social Crisis, 428-436
OFFERMAN, HENRY, The Theology of Karl Barth: An Orientation, 271-288
RAHN, EARL F., Equipment for Religious Education, 347-354
REED, LUTHER D., Planning the Chancel, 169-179
SCHREIBER, O. L., Medieval Libraries, 445-458
WALTEMYER, W. C., The Quest of a Personal God in an Age of Science, 289-302
WILLS, ELBERT VAUGHN, The Elementary-School Ordinance from the Württemberg Church Code of 1559, 355-366

II BOOK REVIEWS

American Lutheran Preaching, edited by Miles H. Krumbine (Paul J. Hoh), 116
Abingdon Bible Commentary, edited by Frederick Carl Eiselen, Edwin Lewis, and David C. Downey (H. C. Alleman; R. T. Stamm), 368
A New Commentary on Holy Scripture, edited by Bishop Gore (H. C. Alleman and R. T. Stamm), 122
BACON, ALBION FELLOWS, *The Path to God* (H. D. Hoover), 254

BAILLIE, JOHN, *The Interpretation of Religion* (John Aberly), 237; extract from the Author's Personal Letter to Reviewer, 498
BARNIKOL, ERNST, *Die vorchristliche und früchristliche Zeit des Paulus* (C. H. Kraeling), 234
BASS, ARCHER B., *Protestantism in the United States* (John B. Moose), 379
BELL, BERNARD IDDINGS, *Beyond Agnosticism, a Book for Tired Mechanists* (John Aberly), 389
BINDER, RUDOLPH N., *Religion as Man's Completion, a Socio-Religious Study* (S. G. Hefelbower), 113
BOREHAM, F. W., *The Fiery Crags* (H. D. Hoover), 254
BOREHAM, F. W., *The Three Half-Moons* (Paul J. Hoh), 498
BRIDGES, HORACE J., *Taking the Name of Science in Vain* (John Aberly), 389
BUCKHAM, JOHN WRIGHT, *The Humanity of God* (John Aberly), 109
BUNDY, WALTER E., *Our Recovery of Jesus* (M. R. Hamsher), 372
CADMAN, S. PARKS, *The Christ of God* (John Aberly), 255
CHAPIN, HENRY D., *Heredity and Child Culture* (H. D. Hoover), 253
COLLIER, FRANK W., *John Wesley Among the Scientists* (John B. Moose), 243
DAVIS, OZORA S., *The Credentials of the Church* (H. D. Hoover), 249
DAY, ALBERT EDWARD, *Present Perils of Religion* (H. D. Hoover), 496
Dictionary of American Biography. Vol. I, edited by Allen Johnson (A. R. Wentz), 103
DOUGHERTY, RAYMOND PHILIP, *Nabonidus and Belshazzar: A Study of the Closing Events of the Neo-Babylonian Empire* (H. C. Alleman), 479
DRESSER, HORATIO W., *Outlines of the Psychology of Religion* (Vergilius Ferm), 487
DUREN, WILLIAM L., *Francis Asbury* (H. D. Hoover), 493
FAY, SIDNEY BRADSHAW, *The Origins of the World War* (Robert Fortenbaugh), 383
FREEMAN, JAMES E., *The Ambassador* (H. D. Hoover), 251
GARRISON, WINFRED E., *Affirmative Religion* (H. D. Hoover), 481
GERBERDING, GEORGE HENRY, *Reminiscent Reflections of a Youthful Octogenarian* (A. R. Wentz), 105
GEDDES, LEONARD and THURSTON, HERBERT, *The Catholic Church and Confession* (Vergilius Ferm), 484
GIFT, FOSTER U., *The Ministry of Love.* A Study book in which special attention is given to the merciful activities of the church (H. C. Alleman), 118
GILBERT, GEORGE H., *Greek Thought in the New Testament* (Carl H. Kraeling), 228
GRAEBNER, TH., *The Story of the Catechism* (H. D. Hoover), 249
GRAY, JOSEPH M. M., *Concerning the Faith* (H. D. Hoover), 496
GRIFFITH-JONES, E., and WELCH, A. C., *The Study Bible: Genesis* (H. C. Alleman) 121
GUIGNEBERT, CHARLES *Christianity, Past and Present* (John O. Evjen), 94

HAAS, JOHN A. W., *What Ought I to Believe?* (Vergilius Ferm), 387
HAMMOND, WILLIAM E., *The Dilemma of Protestantism* (Vergilius Ferm), 382
HAYES, DOREMUS A., *The Heights of Christian Blessedness. A Study of the Beatitudes* (E. E. Fischer), 227
HURST, GEORGE L., *The Literary Background of the New Testament* (Vergilius Ferm), 376
JACKSON, JEROME K. and MALMBERG, CONSTANTINE F., *Religious Education and the State* (Carl C. Rasmussen), 493
JEFFERSON, CHARLES E., *Cardinal Ideas of Jeremiah* (C. T. Benze), 223
JUERGENS, SYLVESTER P., *Newman on the Psychology of Faith* (Vergilius Ferm), 481
KEYSER, LEANDER S., *The Philosophy of Christianity* (John Aberly), 111
KITTEL, RUDOLF, *Great Men and Moments in Israel* (T. W. Kretschmann), 472
KLOTSCHE, E. H., *Christian Symbolics* (Theodore K. Finck), 385; Author's criticism of the Review and the Reviewer's Reply, 499, 502
KRETZSCHMAR, KARL, *The Stewardship Life* (Paul J. Hoh), 496
KOHLER, KAUFMANN, *The Origins of the Synagogue and the Church*, edited by M. G. Enelow (C. T. Benze), 377
KRETZMANN, P. E., *The Religion of the Child* (O. F. Nolde), 495
LATOURETTE, K. S., *A History of Christian Missions in China* (John Aberly), 245
LEUBE, HANS, *Kalvinismus und Luthertum in Zeitalter der Orthodoxie, I* (John C. Mattes), 241
LILLEY, A. L., *Sacraments* (Theodore K. Finck), 384
LIPPMANN, WALTER, *A Preface to Morals* (John Aberly), 389
LUCCOCK, HALFORD, *Preaching Values in New Translations of the New Testament* (H. D. Hoover), 480
LUGAN, ALPHONSE, *Social Principles of the Gospel* (H. D. Hoover), 250
Lutheran Churches of the World, The, edited by Alfred Th. Jorgensen, F. Fleisch, Abdel Ross Wentz (G. L. Kieffer), 488
MARGOLIS, MAX L. and MARX, ALEXANDER, *A History of the Jewish People* (C. T. Benze), 225
MATHEWS, SHAILER, *Jesus on Social Institutions* (M. Coover), 374; (Vergilius Ferm), 375
McCONNELL, BISHOP, *Humanism and Christianity* (H. D. Hoover), 251
McFAYDEN, DONALD, *Understanding the Apostles' Creed* (John Aberly), 107
McWILLIAMS, J. A., *Cosmology* (Vergilius Ferm), 483
MEAKER, SAMUEL RAYNOR, *Mother and the Unborn Child* (H. D. Hoover), 253
Moffatt New Testament Commentary, The (R. T. Stamm), 229
MOORE, EDWARD CALDWELL, *The Spread of Christianity in the Modern World* (J. Russell Fink), 244
MUELLER, JOHN T., *Four Hundredth Anniversary of Luther's Small Catechism* (H. D. Hoover), 249
MYERS, WALTER N., *The Hymns of Saint Hilary of Poitiers in Codex Aretinus* (C. H. Kraeling), 241

NEWTON, JOSEPH FORT, *Altar Stairs* (H. D. Hoover), 249; (Vergilius Ferm), 392
OLIVER, JOHN RATHBONE, *Victim and Victor* (Vergilius Ferm), 497
POPENOE, PAUL, *Conservation of the Family* (H. D. Hoover), 253
POPENOE, PAUL, *Problems of Human Reproduction* (H. D. Hoover), 253
PRATT, JAMES B., *The Pilgrimage of Buddhism* (John Aberly), 114
Preaching in the New Era, edited by Elmore McNeil McKee (H. D. Hoover), 497
REEVES, R. AMBROSE, *A Quiet Room* (H. D. Hoover), 254
Religionswissenschaft der Gegenwart in Selbstdarstellungen, edited by D. Erich Stange (John C. Mattes), 105
REU, M., *Dr. Martin Luther's Small Catechism* (John C. Mattes), 493
RIGGENBACH, D. EDUARD, *Das Comma Johnanneum. Ein nachgelassenes Werk* (John C. Hattes), 236
ROGERS, CLEMENT F., *The Case for Christianity* (John Aberly), 108
RUDISILL, EARL S., *The Intimate Problems of Youth* (John Aberly), 254
SCHRAMM, EDWARD W., *What Shall I do with Jesus?* (H. D. Hoover), 250
SCHUH, L. H., *Saved to Serve* (H. D. Hoover), 250
SINGH, SADHU SUNDAR, *With and Without Christ* (John Aberly), 391
SOARES, THEODORE GERALD, *Religious Education* (M. Hadwin Fischer), 117
STEINHAUSER, ALBERT T. W., *The Man of Sorrows* (H. D. Hoover), 392
SNOWDEN, JOHN H., *Old Faith and New Knowledge* (Theodore K. Finck), 485
SPINKA, MATTHEW, *The Church and the Russian Revolution* (John A. Morehead), 489
STRACK-BILLERBECK, *Kommentar zum neuen Testament* (R. T. Stamm), 230
STREETER, CANON, *Moral Adventure* (E. E. Fischer), 239
TENNANT, F. R., *Philosophical Theology. Volume I: The Soul and Its Faculties* (Theodore K. Finck), 111
Tongues of Fire—a Bible Composed of Sacred Scripture of the Pagan World, compiled by Grace H. Turnbull (John Aberly), 255
TORREY, CHARLES C., *The Second Isaiah: A New Interpretation* (H. C. Alleman), 118
WELCH, ADAM C., *Jeremiah: His Time and His Work* (H. C. Alleman), 367
WHITEHEAD, ALFRED NORTH, *Symbolism, Its Meaning and Effect* (S. G. Hefelbower), 114
WHITNEY, ROY E., *Morality in the Making* (E. E. Fischer), 240
WORKMAN, GEORGE COULSON, *Jesus the Man and Christ the Spirit* (Vergilius Ferm), 376
ZAHN, THEODORE, *Grundriss der neutestamentlischen Theologie; Grundriss der Geschichte des apostolischen Zeitalters; Grundriss der Einleitung in das Neue Testament* (John C. Mattes), 235